

the Congress, as a whole, is discussing minority staffing, meaning staff members responsible and reporting to the minority. A good example of this is the Newark Sunday News of March 31, 1963, which said in part:

In addition to the recent controversy, in which Republicans charged they were not receiving a fair share of the available staff assistance on congressional committees, questions have arisen concerning the uses of staffs and the advisability of increasing staff allowances for both parties.

Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, recently summed up the argument for more staff for both majority and minority: "The most severe limitation to the effectiveness of a Representative or Senator is time." "Staff," Scott said, "was essential to increase the effectiveness of Congressmen by relieving them of a variety of chores and by keeping them informed."

This same newspaper in its edition of March 25, 1963, also said in part, explaining the need for adequate staffs:

A sturdy defense of big congressional staffs comes from Dr. George B. Galloway, senior specialist in American Government for the Library of Congress and former staff director of the Senate-House committee that conducted hearings on the reorganization of Congress in 1946.

"The increase in staff is one of the most favorable developments in Congress," Galloway said in an interview. "It is a third force that provides Congress with information and intelligence to counteract the interested opinions that come to Congress from interesting parties on the one hand and from the executive department on the other."

In Galloway's view, the cause of most of the mushrooming is quite simple: "The problems of Congress today are far different and far more complex than the problems of Congress when CARL VINSON was a freshman."

The problem of obtaining adequate staff responsible to the minority continues to be a serious problem confronting the Members of Congress of both parties, and their respective leaderships.

In the April issue of Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, an article appeared which indicates some of the problems being faced on one of the committees of the House. I was shocked recently to learn from several secretaries working on the Hill that a fine young lady working for the minority had recently been forced to take a very sizable cut in salary because of the reduction of staff funds available for clerical help for the minority. This one human drama is a problem which has appeared in other places and has not been discussed openly or been brought fully to light. However, the conscience of the Members of the House will have to solve some of these serious problems and handicaps facing the minority in the months ahead.

Below follows the full text of the article which appeared in Roll Call:

GOP MOVES FOR ADDED EDUCATION AND LABOR FUNDS

Hard-pressed Republicans on the House Education and Labor Committee are putting up another battle for staff funds.

As the controversial group continued plowing through some of the administration's most vital proposed legislation, GOP members sponsored legislation to give themselves another \$35,000 a year for minority purposes.

Their request would go toward hiring staff help in addition to the two professionals and one clerk now allowed Education and Labor Republicans. At the start of the last Congress, they had one more employee.

Representative CHARLES GOODELL, Republican, of New York, a "young Turk" Education and Labor member, introduced the resolution for more minority funds. He is also on the House Administration Accounts Subcommittee which will first consider the proposal.

The GOP has been grumbling about its treatment ever since the House scaled down Chairman ADAM C. POWELL's, Democrat, of New York, request to \$200,000 a year. Chairmen of six subcommittees were given control of \$25,000 each, leaving POWELL with only \$50,000.

Some Republicans admit POWELL treated them as favorably as could be reasonably expected, considering the amount of funds he had to work with. Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Jr., Republican, of New Jersey, ranking Education and Labor minority member, has been trying to pry loose some funds from subunit heads but has received none.

REQUIRING FUTURE DISTRICT GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES TO LIVE IN THE DISTRICT

(Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL), was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would require future District Government employees to live in the District. This is certainly not asking for special treatment for the District. Nearly every major city in the United States has a requirement that its employees reside in that particular city. Until the District of Columbia has home rule, and I hope this day is not far off, this legislation is certainly a minimum requirement if the citizens of the District are to have confidence in their own officials. And it would certainly aid these officials in their duties by giving them a better understanding of the community in which they would both reside and work.

The District of Columbia faces financial problems paralleled by few metropolitan areas in the United States. Over one-third of the 30,000 municipal employees of the District live outside the District. Their salaries total \$60 million a year. It is grossly unfair for District taxpayers to export such a sum to the suburbs. Residential requirements for city employees would be one step in bringing funds into the District.

In the interests of fiscal equity, social harmony, and good government practice, we should pass this legislation. It should be noted, finally, that this legislation will only apply to the hiring of employees in the future. The current employees of the District will be unaffected by this amendment to the District Code.

"REMEMBER THE MAINE"

(Mr. JOHANSEN (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, one swallow does not make a summer and one Washington Post editorial does not necessarily add up to a firm and consistent policy or program.

Nevertheless, the lead editorial in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Remember the Maine" seems to indicate a significant, albeit much belated, double discovery; namely, that the Kennedy administration has no meaningful Cuban policy and that the American people are becoming completely fed up with this bankruptcy of leadership.

The editorial states, for example:

The broad proposition on which there is accumulating accord is simply this: that the existence of a Communist regime, linked to the Soviet Union, in this hemisphere, is a threat to the safety and survival of the United States and of all other free countries in this part of the globe. No administration that openly opposes this belief can long survive. Sooner or later an administration that denounced this maturing conviction would be followed by an alternative government committed to it.

These are strong words—although no stronger than the sorry record of this administration warrants.

To some of us this conclusion comes with no "Damascus Road" flash of revelation. What is startling is the acknowledgment of this truth by the Washington Post.

It seems obvious to me that this statement would not have been made and indeed would be entirely pointless if the Washington Post had not come to the conclusion, however reluctant, that the Kennedy administration is perilously close to acquiescence in a permanent Soviet occupation and Communist control of Cuba.

The Washington Post calls for a policy and program "of minimum risk," and for the public disclosure of its policy is, by implication at least, a fearful indictment of the gyrations and lack of clear and firm policy of which this administration is guilty.

There is no need at this point to document in detail the evidence of these gyrations. The latest example, I might say, is the pronouncement last Sunday by the Attorney General—whose office seems to have an uncommon prominent role in foreign affairs—that Cuban exiles in this country should perfect their unity of leadership and purpose. These are the same exiles, if memory serves me right, upon whom unprecedented restrictions were imposed by the President only 3 weeks earlier.

I cannot forbear calling attention to one striking coincidence in connection with today's Washington Post editorial. In the same issue—and in fact on the adjoining page—appears a typical contribution by the Nation's chief apostle and advocate of appeasement, Walter Lippmann. Once again Mr. Lippmann pontificates that "Cuba is no military threat to the United States and is not very much of a threat to Latin America." I am not prepared to assume on the basis of a single editorial that the Washington Post is at long last throwing off the deadly spell of Lippmann appeasement.

April 23

Nevertheless, the juxtaposition of the Washington Post editorial and the Lippmann article underscores the agonizing reappraisal which the Kennedy administration is going to have to face vis-a-vis its Cuban policy. As the starting point of this reappraisal, the administration is going to have to decide whether it accepts the Washington Post conclusion that "this sense of jeopardy is beginning to pervade the whole body politic" or whether it is going to continue to ride along with the comforting Lippmann reassurances that neither Castro nor Soviet occupation of Cuba poses any real threat.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include the Washington Post editorial, the Lippmann article, and an address of the Cuban situation which I delivered on the Manion Forum April 7:

"REMEMBER THE 'MAINE'"

Something like a consensus on Cuban policy is beginning to emerge in this country. The debate over when and how that policy is to be executed should not conceal the growing accord on the policy itself. Last week, the President, the former Vice President, the State Department and Republican critics of the State Department had different things to say about Cuba, but on two points there was general agreement. And on these two points there is a gathering agreement in the country.

The broad proposition on which there is accumulating accord is simply this: That the existence of a Communist regime, linked to the Soviet Union, in this hemisphere, is a threat to the safety and survival of the United States and of all other free countries in this part of the globe. No administration that openly opposes this belief can long survive. Sooner or later an administration that denounced this maturing conviction would be followed by an alternative government committed to it. In a negative way, there is almost the same accord on how this policy should not be pursued. There is almost universal agreement that invasion, openly and directly, immediately or in the near future, is not the way to pursue our policy.

This aversion to foreign control of Cuba by a hostile power is the constant of American attitudes toward our island neighbor. The Monroe Doctrine was an expression of a view already long held in this country. It was given even fuller expression in the administration of John Quincy Adams when this country made known its opposition to the transfer of Cuba from Spain to France, England, or any other power. The practical basis of this policy was clearly stated in Daniel Webster's support of President Adams' decision to send delegates to a conference with South American countries, in which the great orator said:

"A member has said that if Spain chose to transfer the island to any other power she has a right to do so, and we here cannot interfere to prevent her. I must dissent from this opinion. The rights of nations in matters of this kind are much modified by circumstances. Because France or Great Britain could not rightfully complain of the transfer of Florida to us, it does not follow that we could not complain of the cession of Cuba to one of them. The transfer of Florida to us was not dangerous to the safety of either of these nations, nor fatal to any of their great and essential interests. Proximity of position, neighborhood, whatever augments the power of injuring or annoying, very properly belong to the consideration of all cases of this kind. What might otherwise never be thought of is justified for these reasons and on these grounds."

If the American people are aware of such dangers now, they are aware of other dangers that unhappily and unfortunately also exist and that must be weighed with equal care and caution. Impetuous and impulsive and ill-considered acts by this country might bring on the dangers of thermonuclear war without diminishing the dangers of Soviet occupation of Cuba.

Therefore, it must be the object of the Government of the United States to develop some alternative to direct action that will further the policy of this country without incurring the hazards of invasion or like military intervention. It is very urgent that the Government develop such a policy and that it disclose it. It is very plain that, throughout this country, the conviction that the Nation is in peril is hardening to a point where no threats and no fears may be sufficient to inhibit the demand for action against the forces that occupy Cuba. Democratic governments are not wholly free agents. A government that does not develop a program of minimum risk runs the danger of being coerced into a program of maximum risks, almost against its will. The absence of an affirmative design, in such a situation, is dangerous—dangerous to this country, to its neighbors and to the peace of the hemisphere and of the whole world.

The Government of this country, the governments of friendly countries and the government of the Soviet Union as well had better take note of the increasing sense of Americans that the United States is endangered by the Soviet occupation of Cuba. This sense of jeopardy is beginning to pervade the whole body politic. The Soviet Government, whatever its fears and doubts, felt compelled, by such an impulse, to send its forces into Hungary. It ought to understand the much greater force that such sentiments exert upon democratic governments. Every day that passes without the termination of the Soviet occupation of Cuba increases the certainty and multiplies the likelihood that another Maine disaster will put the spark to the combustible materials in the Caribbean.

THE KENNEDY-KEATING CUBAN POLICY
(By Walter Lippmann)

Cuba got a good airing last week before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and the significant fact about the speeches of the President, Secretary Rusk, and Senator Keating was that there is substantial agreement about what the United States should and should not do. It is hard to say what Mr. Nixon's Cuban policy would be. He sounded like a man who was ready to go to war. But all he actually said was that he wanted the Cuban exiles to make hit-and-run raids.

Senator KEATING, who is the most conspicuous of the critical opposition, began by saying that "it is foolish to pretend that there are easy answers to the Cuban problem." He did not pretend. Then in the course of his speech he admitted that he agrees with the main theses of our present Cuban policy. He is opposed to an invasion. He is opposed to a blockade. He is opposed to hit-and-run raids mounted from American soil. He is in favor of "greater stress on nonmilitary measures," and he wants to exert increasing economic pressure so that the Soviets "will be driven to the conclusion that the price of maintaining a base in Cuba is too high."

This is the same story which the administration is telling. Senator KEATING's differences are not in the substance of the text but in the editing, the typography, the layout, and the captions. The Senator, like the President, excludes in present circumstances the resort to war—invasion, blockade, and raiding; like the President he too would deal with Cuba by surveillance, con-

tainment, isolation, economic pressures, and propaganda.

There is no doubt that at least for some time to come the Kennedy-Keating policy will leave the Soviet troops 90 miles from Florida. This is an affront to our pride. Not since Napoleon III put French troops into Mexico to enthrone and support the Emperor Maximilian has anything like this happened so close to us. In the end the French troops went away. But, because there was no prudent alternative, Lincoln put up with the Bonapartist troops for several years.

How long must we put up with the Russian troops? The honest answer is that we must put up with them until they can be gotten rid of by measures short of nuclear war. Here is the sticking point in the argument with Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon. They sound, they intend to sound, as if they know a way to get rid of the Russian troops promptly without waging nuclear war.

What is this prompter way to make the Russians go away from Cuba? They do not tell us, but the most reasonable interpretation of what they say is that the prompter way is not to make war but to threaten war. Both Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon have avoided saying plainly what they do mean. But if what they sound like has genuine meaning it is that they believe the United States can deliver an ultimatum which the Soviet Union will bow to.

If this is not what they mean, what in the name of commonsense do they mean with all their big words? If they are prepared to be so bold with the Russians, they ought to be bold enough to talk plainly to their fellow Americans.

The Rockefeller-Nixon position appears then to be that Cuba can be liberated by ordering the Soviet Union to withdraw from this hemisphere, and to stand by passively while we blockade Castro and arrange for a replacement of Castro's government. If this is what they have in mind, they are making an enormous guess. For nobody can possibly know that the Soviet Union would surrender its whole position in Cuba as it surrendered its offensive weapons last October. It is the supreme folly in the nuclear age to drive a nuclear power into a corner. And if the Soviet Union refused to bow to the ultimatum, all this would do for us would be to make us look like fools.

The President of the United States cannot play with an ultimatum to a government like that of the Soviet Union. He cannot use an ultimatum unless he is prepared to go through with it and begin a war. If he is not prepared to go to war, an ultimatum is a bluff and everyone will soon see that it is.

While the present policy does not promise a quick withdrawal of the Russians or the fall of Castro, it is surely not true to say that it is complacent do-nothingism. To a degree which is just short of war Cuba is being photographed, patrolled, embargoed and squeezed, and isolated. If Cuba were a great power, we would be at war with her for what we are already doing. I doubt whether there is any precedent where we have exerted such strong measures short of war on any other country.

However much we are impatient and frustrated we have to grasp the fact that Cuba is no military threat to the United States and is not very much of a threat to Latin America. The worst of Castro is his example and a long way after that such agents as he is able to train and infiltrate into the Latin American countries. He is an affront to our pride, he is a nuisance, he is a mischiefmaker. But he is not a mortal threat to the vital interests of the United States, and therefore, in this age of thermo-

nuclear war, we must deal with him by measures that are short of war.

ADDRESS BY HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN,
MANION FORUM, APRIL 7, 1963

More than 40 months ago, in a public address October 29, 1959, I asked this question, apropos of the Communist threat posed by Castro's takeover of Cuba: "Where better than in our own hemisphere and continent can we take the stand which survival itself dictates must be taken?"

In the years since, I have been repeating that question in varying forms and with many elaborations, so have countless other Americans, in and out of public office.

The answer, in terms of adequate policies and deeds, has not been forthcoming either under the previous or present administrations. For a moment, before the fiasco became evident, we thought we had found the answer at the Bay of Pigs.

For a brief few days last October we thought the stand was being taken. But this firm answer quickly faded out—with the announced willingness to give a no-invasion pledge, with abandonment of the demand for on-site inspection, and with the premature lifting of the naval quarantine.

I do not need to remind my listeners of the many other adverse developments of the past 40 months—or of the situation today. But I do call your attention to a statement last February 7 by President Kennedy: "I couldn't make any prediction about the elimination (of communism in Cuba). I am quite obviously hopeful that it can be eliminated, but we have to wait and see what happens * * *. I remember a good deal of talk in the early 1950's about liberation, how Eastern Europe was going to be liberated. Then we had Hungary, Poland, and East Germany and no action was taken. The reason no action was taken was that they felt strongly if they did take action it would bring on another war."

Granted that this statement was made in response to a newsmen's inquiry—under the catch-as-catch-can conditions to which the President subjects himself in his news conferences.

Yet, how can even the most responsible Member of Congress or any thoughtful citizen avoid asking what message this statement signals to our enemies—to Khrushchev, Castro, to the international Communist plotters of progressive takeover of Latin America and of ultimate world conquest?

How can we avoid asking whether this statement does not, to an uncomfortable degree, correspond to the facts as to our Cuban policy—or lack of policy?

I address myself to two aspects of the President's statement.

It was Charles Dickens' famous character, Mr. Micawber, who immortalized the attitude of "waiting for something to turn up." Are we not in truth now following a Mr. Micawber foreign policy so far as Cuba and the Communist threat in Latin America are concerned? Or, at the very least, are we not giving our enemies the basis for so assuming—thereby laying the foundation for very grave miscalculations on their part?

Unfortunately I see no convincing evidence of any meaningful policy other than that of "wait and see." The Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in a report dated March 14, flatly declared, after extensive hearings, that "no plan for collective action against Communist subversive aggression has been put into effect."

WHILE WE "WAIT AND SEE"—THE COMMUNISTS ACT

The recent San Jose conference has apparently produced no specifics—except stepped up aid to Central American countries; and the same subcommittee report noted that

the success of any long-range economic aid program for Latin America "is dependent on reducing and finally eliminating the threat of subversive aggression."

Isn't the emphasis on economic aid at this point like arguing that the foundations of a house should be repaired while the house is in flames?

Whether effective joint efforts will result from this conference adequate to stem Communist infiltration of arms and personnel remains to be seen. The President has declared that "further action, invasion, or blockade, at this time would (not) be fruitful."

Meanwhile, the propagandists for the do-nothing, or do-nothing-more philosophy, are operating full blast. Walter Lippman pontificates that "there is no clear and certain solution in the present phase of the Cuban problem."

We are sternly warned against a "Cuban fixation"—which means, "quit worrying about it." And Columnist Murrey Marder sees the best hope of a solution in some unforeseen and unpredictable "lucky break."

For 40 months we have followed a "wait and see what happens" policy. The results have been calamitous. There is every reason to believe that results of a continuation of this policy will be no different—unless they are even more calamitous.

We may wait—but events don't wait. Mr. Khrushchev won't wait, and the Latin American countries and people who face the loss of their freedom to Castro-type takeovers can't wait.

Even more disquieting is the second half of President Kennedy's statement at his February 7 news conference. He said the reason no action was taken to back up the talk of liberation of Communist-captured countries in the 1950's was that it was "felt strongly if they did take action it would bring on another war."

Does this mean what it seems to mean? Are we telling Mr. Khrushchev that we automatically reject any measures against Communist takeover in Latin America or against Castro which he—Khrushchev—might decide justified his launching nuclear war?

Isn't this an open invitation to nuclear blackmail? Isn't this an abandonment of the courageous willingness to risk war which Mr. Kennedy briefly displayed last October? Doesn't this confirm Senator Lausche's blunt warning: "Khrushchev is pushing us, we are retreating. The more we retreat, the more he will push."

I submit that there is not a single argument presently being offered against effective action regarding Cuba which cannot be offered with equal force and logic against effective action regarding any future Cubas.

Is there any doubt that there will be additional Cubas?

Or that these same arguments against action will again be advanced?

And will not any risks we might run in calling a halt now also be present in the face of new Cubas—and, indeed, may not such risks in the future actually be magnified?

And so doesn't the "wait and see" attitude and the "risk of war" argument all add up to piecemeal, and ultimate, capitulation?

There is another, immediate, grave problem. Is it now administration policy to prevent, at all costs, any liberation efforts by Cuban exiles themselves—on the grounds that such action will irritate Soviet Russia and risk war? Can we expect to retain world respect or our own self-respect—or can we expect to silence the Cuban exiles themselves—if we by words or worse openly oppose their own future liberation efforts?

Are we to do to any future Cuban liberation leaders what we did to Chiang Kai-shek when the 7th Fleet, on President Truman's orders, blockaded him on Formosa during the Korean war? Is this what is meant by

waiting to see what happens? I am convinced that such a colossal blunder is actually in the making.

OUR ALTERNATIVE NOW: STAND UP TO COMMUNISM IN CUBA OR, SURRENDER

In February, I introduced a joint resolution expressing this Nation's determination to take, jointly with other free nations or unilaterally, such political, diplomatic, and military action as may be necessary, to remove and hereafter bar Soviet or other foreign Communist military forces from Cuba; to liberate Cuba itself; to neutralize Cuba as a base for Communist subversion, infiltration, sabotage, and aggression in this hemisphere; to establish representative constitutional government in Cuba through free elections, and to exercise such on-site inspection and supervision as are necessary to accomplish these results.

I believe these actions should proceed from less drastic to more drastic steps as circumstances may require; such as termination of diplomatic relations between Western Hemisphere countries (including the United States) and the Communist countries (including Soviet Russia); effective restrictions on importation of personnel and arms from Cuba to Latin American countries; restoration of effective naval blockade of Cuba; firm notice, with a time limit, that Soviet troops must be withdrawn; and finally, liberation of Cuba, either by the forces of a Cuban exile government, or by joint OAS forces, or by the United States alone—as may be necessary.

For 40 months I have lived—and, more importantly, the American people have lived—with the question I asked in October 1959. The question persists: "Where better than in our own hemisphere and continent can we take the stand which survival itself dictates must be taken?"

NO. 1 CITY: LIBERTY, KY.

(Mr. SILER (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, a high honor and significant recognition has come to one of the cities in my congressional district. The city is Liberty, Ky., which I hope and trust will always live up to that sacred appellation, and it has been designated as the "No. 1 City in Kentucky," by the Kentucky Chamber of Commerce. The citizens of Liberty, where I have visited many times and where I have enjoyed the hospitality of some of their homes, are justly proud of this honor. Their Congressman is likewise proud of this honor and is grateful for a news item that refers to an outstanding award such as this instead of merely continuing to mention some of the dark tragedy of our depressed economy. Below is the news item that many will find stimulating and inspiring in the face of misfortune and hardship that are, like the poor, with us always:

The city of Liberty has been declared the No. 1 city in Kentucky.

The county seat of Casey County was proclaimed the overall State winner in the 1962 Kentucky Chamber of Commerce community development contest today at the State chamber annual meeting in Lexington.

Liberty won over 7 district winners who represented an original field of 84 entries.

The No. 1 city in community development is not a newcomer to the winner's circle as they won in the district competition in the 1960 and 1961 contests.

A new look came to Liberty through a well-planned and executed beautification program. Streets were repaved, new homes and churches were constructed, retail establishments were remodeled and improved, a "litterbug" contest was launched and a memorial shrub center was planted on the Liberty graded school lawn.

The presentation of a plaque designating the top spot was made by Malcolm Mason, Lexington, chairman of the State chamber's community development contest. The honor was received by Mrs. Arils Sanders, representing the Liberty-Casey County Community Development Association. Later, Mason announced, a bronze plaque will be placed in a prominent spot in Liberty for generations in the future to see the city's recognition in the 1962 contest.

Receiving the runner-up awards as district winners were: Barlow, Campbellsville, Flemingsburg, Prestonsburg, Somers, and Sturgis.

INCOME TAX REFORM

(Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. KUNKEL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, after many weeks of hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on President Kennedy's tax proposals, it has become increasingly clear that the Kennedy tax reforms will not achieve the results promised. For the information of my colleagues, I think it is important to point out that witness after witness before the committee has testified that the Kennedy proposals are self-defeating and, if passed, would curtail, not unleash our economy.

Certainly tax reform is needed. Most assuredly tax cuts are a necessity if we are to strengthen our private enterprise system. Our present hodgepodge of tax law, our almost disregard of fiscal responsibility when it comes to Federal spending which results in taxes which are bordering on being completely confiscatory, is drying up the basic food of capitalism, risk capital.

Several responsible proposals have been presented for workable tax reform. A number of us support the Baker-Herlong formula for gradual reform with tax adjustments in every bracket. I, myself, have introduced a measure to provide discussion for a flat percentage tax which would cost all of us less, provide greater equity and reduce the costs of tax collection.

To provide the latest available material in connection with our tax studies, I will include at this point in the Record an article from the U.S. News & World Report, by René A. Wormser, a leading tax authority. I think Mr. Wormser's study will convince many of the need for an entirely new tax code:

IS IT TIME TO WRITE A WHOLE NEW INCOME TAX LAW?—WHAT A LEADING TAX AUTHORITY SAYS

(NOTE.—"Reform" the income tax law? Not on any piecemeal basis, urges a top authority on taxes.

(The only solution, say René A. Wormser, is to start over and write a new law. As for the present law, "Congress has created a monster." Here, in detail, Mr. Wormser sets out the taxpayer's problem and offers a solu-

tion. In this article, written for U.S. News & World Report, he draws on 40 years' experience as a leading New York lawyer, specializing in taxes and estates.)

(By René A. Wormser)

Prompted by a message from President Kennedy, Congress is now struggling with proposals for the reform of our income tax laws.

There is general recognition that tax rates are far too high and that the system is badly maladjusted.

But the specific proposals of the President for reform are largely designed with political motivation, and, in great part, are unsound. They are likely to increase the harassment of already distressed taxpayers. They do not begin to strike at the basic fallacies of our tax system.

What is urgently needed is a careful re-examination of our whole tax structure. Tinkering with the tax laws is not the answer.

Congress has created a monster. As a former Internal Revenue Commissioner has put it: There is no answer short of wiping the slate clean and starting over.

Tax laws should be understandable to the citizen of average intelligence, but our Internal Revenue Code is so infinitely complex that it is far beyond this comprehension of all but experts.

Indeed, there are few experts, if any, who know and understand all its provisions.

In its rates, and often in its theory, our income tax system is frequently very harsh and even punitive. Therefore, considerable sections of the American bar and of our accountants apply their brains and energy to the devising of ways in which to get around objectionable features of the law by legal means.

A way is found in which legitimately to avoid a harsh rule, whereupon the Internal Revenue Service—at its own instance or prompted by a legislator or a pressure group—concludes that a loophole has appeared in the law. The loophole is then closed by a new piece of legislation, intended to be remedial.

Generally, more complexity results.

It is often impossible to anticipate the full effect of a remedial provision. It frequently opens up further loopholes of which clever tax experts take legal advantage. So the process of opening and closing loopholes goes on interminably until we have a pyramiding of provisions which truly are enough to confound genius.

As for the businessman who must deal with this complex monster, he not only cannot understand the beast himself but cannot always get a positive and clear answer from his confounded advisers.

Many of the President's current proposals are attempts to close what he or his advisers deem to be loopholes. Some, offered in part to simplify some rule, certainly will end by adding further complications to existing intricacy.

Consider, first, the impact of the tax laws themselves, and the effect of changes proposed by President Kennedy.

We have lived under the system of progressive tax rates so long that most of us have come to accept it as a self-evident logical application of the theory of paying in accordance with ability to pay.

Yet a top rate of 91 percent to a man whose income runs into the hundreds of thousands per year punishes him far less than a rate of 50 percent reached by a single man after attaining a taxable income of \$16,000, or a married man after reaching \$32,000.

Nor are the top tax brackets realistic. They produce very little in revenues. Not only can the wealthy use tax-exempt investments, but all sorts of mechanisms are available to them devised by tax experts for reducing the income tax impact.

This has been recognized now, even by those most anxious to use the income tax for sociological reasons.

The President has suggested that the top rate eventually be reduced from 91 to 85 percent, though he proposes an absurdly small reduction, to only 84.5 percent, for 1963.

But the unfairness of the progressive-rate system would persist if, in reducing the top rate, there were merely an approximately proportionate reduction in middle rates.

Suppose, for example, the top rate for a single man after attaining a taxable income of \$16,000 were reduced from 50 to 35 percent. The impact of this rate upon him would be far greater in actuality than the impact of a 85-percent rate on a man with hundreds of thousands of dollars of income.

The conclusion is inevitable that the citizen who is most hurt by the progressive personal income tax system is the man in the middle, the man in the economic class which is most important to our society. The class includes the professionals, the self-employed, the big-grade artisans, the teachers, the small businessmen.

This class, in particular, is hurt by two philosophic absurdities which underlie the progressive tax system. The reward granted for extra work and greater effort is the imposition of a higher tax rate; and, after a member of this class has gone through what is usually a long period of economic struggle, his peak income is clipped off by the tax law during that often short period in which he has attained financial success. Indeed, Government-created inflation increases his tax burden.

Many idealistic reformers want to use the income tax to improve and extend education and to protect the public health.

Yet these same reformers are unwilling to give adequate tax relief to the citizen who wishes to support education or to protect his health.

This is a grave example of the distorted use of the tax system to sociological ends.

Why should a citizen have to pay any income tax on the money he uses to pay for his and his family's medical expenses?

If my family suffers illness, my ability to pay is certainly reduced, but the tax law gives me only very partial relief.

Pressure for public health-relief measures, such as medicare, are based in part on the fact that medical expenses have increased materially over the years. Why not, then, allow me to deduct my full medical expenses on my income tax return?

Similarly, Federal aid to education is pressed on the ground that education has become so expensive. Why, then, am I not permitted to deduct the expenses of educating my children?

The President's reform proposals indicate that he recognizes the logic of the foregoing arguments only in part. He proposes no relief for educational expense. He does—admirably—propose the abolition of the ceiling on medical deductions. But he suggests that the floor on medical deductions—including drugs—be increased from 3 to 4 percent of adjusted gross income.

There is a direct conflict here between those who believe that the individual should be encouraged to help himself and those who believe that he should be prevented from helping himself, in order that the Government could step in, as a father, to protect him.

The President proposes an overall 5 percent floor on all itemized deductions—including medical. This could be tragic to many taxpayers. If a deduction is proper in theory, why should it not be deductible in full?

Here is but one of the odd results which would follow the President's deduction proposal: A taxpayer paying alimony to his wife could not deduct it in whole even though his wife, in turn, would be obliged to include the full payments in her own tax return.

no slaveholder would care about owning the man if he can own the products of the man's labor. A slave is a person to whom economic freedom is denied. From this premise the denial of all other freedoms follows.

(8) For every right there is a collateral responsibility. The rights with which an individual is endowed by the Creator impose on him a duty to use those rights in conformity with the moral law as derived from such statements as the Ten Commandments and the "Sermon on the Mount." From this source flows that inner restraint or self-discipline which is essential for a free social order. Edmund Burke said, "Society cannot exist unless a controlling power upon the will and appetite is placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within the more there must be of it without." Unless there is a generally prevailing individual self-discipline, which stems from devotion to the moral law, it is impossible to achieve that balance between public order and personal freedom which is essential for spiritual and material well-being.

The ACA program consists of two parts. Part A is to distribute educational materials to inform our citizens with respect to the principles of constitutional conservatism, the organization and functions of government in a free society, the nature of the national crisis which now confronts us, and many related subjects. A great deal of such educational work is carried on effectively by other organizations. Therefore, ACA limits its activities in this area to providing supplementary aid and distributing publications which apply specifically to ACA's work.

Part B of our program is in the area of political action. Here we aim to furnish professional assistance to conservative candidates for the Congress in primary and general elections. In addition to expert advisers on political organization and procedures, ACA furnishes news releases, campaign literature and other data to the extent permitted by our financial resources.

While Congress is in session, we issue a monthly "Digest and Tally" which contains analyses of crucial measures pending in the Congress and records the vote of each Senator and Representative on such measures.

At the end of each session of Congress, we publish the "ACA-Index," which contains the voting records of all Senators and Representatives on those crucial measures acted on in the session just ended, as well as cumulative voting records from 1955 for Senators and from 1957 for Representatives.

The ACA-Index is comprised of one major and six subsidiary indexes which constitute the basis for rating the voting records of legislators. They are defined as follows:

(1) The consistency index: For safeguarding the rights of the individual and strengthening constitutional Government and against group morality, a socialized economy and centralization of government power.

(2) For sound money and fiscal integrity and against inflation.

(3) For a free market economy and against Government price fixing and controls.

(4) For States rights and against Central Government intervention in local affairs.

(5) For private ownership of production and distribution and against Government ownership and competition with private industry.

(6) For individual rights and responsibilities and against coercion and regimentation by Government.

(7) For strengthening our national sovereignty and against surrendering control of our foreign or domestic affairs to international organizations usually dominated by nations whose ideals differ drastically from those of most Americans.

Indexes are used to calculate the voting score," each one of his

votes as entered in the official records of the Congress being marked "plus" or "minus" depending on whether it supports or opposes the principle enunciated in the index or indexes under which the vote is listed by ACA.

By means of the ACA-Index voters throughout the country can learn what crucial issues were acted on by the Congress and how their representatives voted on them. This information can serve as a useful guide for our citizens in political and governmental affairs.

In addition to the ACA-Index and the Digest and Tally, ACA has organized 28 local chapters throughout the country, and more are being formed.

ACA issues public endorsements of those legislators whom it will support and who desire such endorsement. At the end of each Congress, distinguished service awards are presented to Senators and Representatives whose voting records indicate their substantial agreement with the principles of constitutional conservatism, and who wish to accept the award.

In the 1960 national elections, the first in which ACA was active, we assisted, in varying degrees, in 180 contests for 21 Senate seats and 159 House seats. One hundred thirty-three or 74 percent of the candidates supported by ACA were elected.

In the 1962 national elections, we supported 184 candidates in all, 19 for the Senate and 165 for the House. Of these, 135 or 73 1/2 percent were successful.

We are frequently asked whether we would be more effective if we affiliated with one or the other of the two major parties. We believe we would not.

The 1962 elections revealed that both parties consist essentially of three groups, a liberal left, a conservative right, and a middle-of-the-road.

This presents a problem for the voter who wants to direct his moral, financial, or working support to one or the other of these groups in either party, because, in most elections the party label is the only distinction between opposing candidates. That is, a candidate receives the support of his party even though his political stance and his voting record differ greatly from those generally prevailing in that party.

This occurs frequently. The resulting conflict between party loyalty and the desire to support only candidates who will promote the political and economic views which the voter favors often induces him not to vote at all. If this practice grows, it may well cause a breakdown of representative government.

While the theory of party responsibility is in accord with American political tradition, it ceases to have significance when there are no generally prevailing fundamental principles which govern party policies and which distinguish one party from the other.

This explains why legislators frequently cross party lines in voting on such crucial issues as packing the House Rules Committee, medical care for the aged through social security, foreign economic aid, Federal aids to education, U.S. assistance to Communist-dominated countries, curbing the coercive power of labor unions, and others.

ACA provides a means by which citizens can support candidates in either party who vote to preserve the principles of constitutional conservatism.

In the foregoing I have tried to show that without individual self-imposed inner disciplines, the free society cannot endure; that our Republic was founded and grew prosperous on the doctrine of interdependence of religious and secular rights and duties; that in recent decades we have moved sharply away from the concepts of our political forebears; that, in consequence, we now face a national crisis of morals; and that it is the duty of each of us to shoulder

his share of the responsibility for correcting our defections.

It is easy enough for any people to have a King John. All that is necessary is for good men and women to do nothing. But in such case we must ask: "From whence will come the barons who will fight to regain our lost freedoms?" No one can delegate his personal responsibility to anyone else. If each one here today joins with all other like-minded patriots throughout our land, we can regain and preserve our sacred heritage.

I conclude with these inspiring lines from Edward Everett Hale:

"I am only one, but I am one
I can't do everything, but I can do something
And what I can do, that I ought to do
And what I ought to do, by the grace of God,
I shall do."

Abner W. Siball
Coexisting With Castro—An Editorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial is taken from the Vision Letter, a privately published, weekly analysis of Latin American affairs. The editorial states propositions and asks questions that command attention and demand forthright answers in regard to our policy toward Cuba, if it can be called that. The editorial speaks clearly; we must all wish the administration did likewise:

COEXISTING WITH CASTRO—AN EDITORIAL

A major policy decision on Cuba has been taken in Washington. Despite protestations to the contrary, the administration has decided to "coexist" with Fidel Castro. This is the inescapable conclusion to be drawn from recent Government statements and actions, beginning with the President's "wall of dedicated men" speech in San José, Costa Rica, and ending with the clampdown on Cuban exile raiders.

The U.S. press in recent weeks has been nibbling at this story, sensing it but never quite believing it. The U.S. public, as a result, is in the dark. But it is a fact. After years of noise and alarms, troop movements, bellicose speeches and pronouncements, capital intrigues, etc., the Kennedy administration has finally thrown in the towel.

Out of bafflement as much as insight, the guessing game is on as to whether there is a "deal" behind it all: either between Kennedy and Khrushchev or Kennedy and Castro. But for the simple reason that the United States is getting all the bad, none of the good, the theory is doubtful. The Communists carry on, business as usual, openly in Vietnam and Laos, covertly in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. And the Red regime in Cuba, with Washington's blessings, goes on as serenely as its own mismanagement permits. And the United States gets a consolation prize: only 12,000 Soviet troops in the Caribbean instead of 21,000.

The President must set the record straight. If there is a deal, the people should be told what they have gained to make a Communist Cuba more palatable. If there is no deal, they have a right to know about that too. If Castro's overthrow is no longer a prime U.S. aim, then the public not only of the United States but of the whole hemisphere should be told why. For the situation today

for women, a defect not corrected until 1920 by the 19th amendment.

Furthermore, while the Virginia Declaration was specific in defining the citizen's right to use and dispose of his honestly acquired property, our Declaration substituted an ambiguous paraphrase which asserted the individual's right to the "pursuit of happiness." Over the years, zealous "do-gooders" and political opportunists have interpreted this to mean the "right to happiness, at the expense of someone else." They choose to overlook the fact that our forebears asserted only the right to "pursue" happiness, the responsibility for catching up with it resting with the pursuer.

Later, there were detected in the Constitution real or imaginary ambiguities in the wording of the general welfare clauses, the interstate commerce clause, and most recently, the provision in the first amendment which prohibits Congress from making any "law respecting an establishment of religion." As was to be expected, these alleged ambiguities have been seized upon as vehicles to enhance government power and to impose social changes on our people by use of government force, rather than to achieve them peacefully by education and persuasion.

But, in spite of these defects, which are in essence but reflections of that frailty characteristic of all human endeavor, our Constitution stands as a sturdy bulwark of individual freedom in these United States, this "last best hope of earth."

While this progress was being achieved in America, grave events were brewing in France. These culminated in violent revolution. In 1789, the French Constituent Assembly voted a Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen. This was a major contribution to the progress of liberty. But it contained the seeds of its own destruction, as is evident when we compare certain concepts of our founders with those of the great minds of France who prepared their declaration.

The political agency envisioned in our Declaration and made operative by our Constitution was designed to end man's control of men. The goal was a society in which each person would be free to govern himself, with political intervention sanctioned only to remove outside interference with this aim. The disciplines and controls were to come from within a man's own being as he sought to live out the demands of his religion. Our founders held that individual freedom cannot survive unless it is policed by the inner disciplines of the moral law.

By contrast, the French revolutionaries of this period tossed both religion and historical experience overboard. They tried to establish a completely rational and completely new society, one which sought to emphasize the primacy of the rights of man by denying the existence of God. The result was the reign of terror, which ended in the dictatorship of Napoleon.

George Washington probably had both America and France in mind when he said in his farewell address:

"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. . . . And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can prevail without religion. . . . Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Nevertheless, the French Declaration of Rights has a place of honor on the roster of great pronouncements on human liberty. It is notable that it asserted that the "public force," which we designate as the "political power, is instituted for the advantage of all," and is not to be used for the benefit of those who control it. Furthermore, although this provision was later to be "more honored in

the breach than in the observance," their Declaration held that private property is "an inviolable and sacred right."

There remain in the chronological listing of the great documents of freedom the Emancipation Proclamation of President Lincoln in 1863, and the Women's Suffrage Act of 1920, to which I have already referred.

As to the Emancipation Proclamation, the fact that its application was limited to "all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States," and that slaves in States whose people were not in rebellion were not freed, raises the suspicion that the noble motives which inspired the Proclamation was somewhat tainted by the demands of political expediency. Even so, the Proclamation constituted a gigantic step toward the abolition of human slavery in the United States, which was ultimately achieved by the 13th amendment in 1865.

I have described these historic pronouncements on the rights and duties of man because I believe that, collectively, they constitute the guiding light by which we must chart the course of our thoughts and actions if we are to regain and preserve our sacred heritage of freedom in America.

Your President has suggested that I tell you something about the organization which I have the honor to head and whose purpose is to promote the principles I have described.

Americans for Constitutional Action was established in 1959 by a group of citizens who believe that the United States now faces a crisis of such proportions as to involve their very survival as a Federal Republic and ourselves as a free people.

The basic issue is freedom of choice for the individual. Freedom of enterprise, speech, worship, assembly and the others, are but reflections of this basic freedom. Impair free enterprise, free speech or any other and you are sure to impair the right of some individuals to choose freely.

To minimize the danger of obstructing freedom of choice, our governmental structure was designed to prevent concentrations of monopoly power in any branch of government or in any sector of society.

A system of checks and balances was devised to make sure that the power of the Government in Washington would be offset by the powers of the States. And within the States, there were to be similar checks on State powers by subordinate units of government. Furthermore, at each level of government there were to be balancing forces between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

Our political forebears believed that only by dispersion or fragmentation of power, whether it be physical, economic, social, or political, can one avoid the hazards of its explosive force.

Unfortunately, we have departed to an alarming degree from the principles which guided them. This is indicated by the gigantic growth of the Federal Government and the parallel shrinkage of State sovereignty and personal freedom.

The Federal Government now owns 33.8 percent of the land acreage within the boundaries of the 50 States. It owns and operates more than 3,000 business and commercial activities in competition with its own citizens, and its functions are carried on by some 2,000 major operating units.

Parenthetically, the land acreage now owned by all levels of government, Federal, State and local is 39.1 percent of the total. This constitutes an alarming restriction on the freedom of our citizens to undertake new ventures and thus to stimulate economic growth.

Our institutions—political, economic, educational and social—are largely in the hands of the enemy. I do not refer here to avowed Socialists and Communists. The bald fact

is that the American people and their once free institutions have been engulfed by the welfare state and its protagonists whose goal is to centralize all power, political, economic and social in the hands of the political apparatus in Washington.

What does ACA propose to do about this?

We are a nonpartisan, nonprofit, nationwide, political action organization dedicated to two basic theses: First, that the Constitution of the United States, as originally conceived, provides a solid foundation on which was built the structure of our free social order, and second, if we are to preserve that order, we must restore the original integrity of its foundation and then protect it from erosion or destruction.

ACA believes that if a significant number of dedicated constitutional conservatives are elected to the Congress of the United States, they will retard and, eventually, reverse the current movement of our Nation into socialism and toward a completely regimented society.

To this end, ACA helps to elect those candidates who, by their actions, have proved their allegiance to the original spirit and principles of our Declaration and Constitution. We have defined these principles as follows:

(1) Man derives, directly from the Creator, his rights to life, to liberty and to the means of acquiring and possessing property. These rights are inherent and inalienable. They are not mere privileges granted by Government, subject to withdrawal at the whim of Government, as decreed by political overlords.

(2) To deprive a man of his God-given rights is to violate a natural law. This will call forth its own penalties, as does the violation of any natural law, moral or physical.

(3) No man has a right to deprive his posterity of their God-given rights. Just as he may not sell them into slavery, so may he not vote away their economic or political freedoms. Jefferson held that the act of deferring payment on the public debt, thus imposing this burdens on future generations, is tantamount to enslaving them.

4. The powers of government are obtained from God, or by forcible seizure, or from voluntary delegation by the individual citizens. Long ago we rejected the doctrine of "divine right of kings," as well as "divine right of majorities." Nor do we concede the right of government to seize powers which belong to individuals. There remains only one morally sanctioned source of governmental power, i.e., voluntary delegation by individuals. But, since one cannot delegate that which he does not possess, it follows that governments can exercise, with moral propriety, only those powers which individuals first possessed and then delegated to government.

5. Because the essence of government is power, which is wielded by fallible human beings, safeguards must be erected against the abuse of government authority, to make sure that the instrument forged to protect the rights of the people will not be used to destroy those rights.

6. To secure the blessings of economic freedom, from which all other freedoms flow, we must preserve a free market, with government intruding only to protect individual rights and to prevent predatory action. It is only under this system that the individual can exercise his freedom of choice effectively, using his dollars as ballots with which he can vote for those enterprises which serve him best.

(7) Onerous or punitive taxation, including the cruellest tax of all, inflation, destroys economic freedom. It is unfortunate that we have carelessly surrendered freedom in the economic sphere, forgetting the old adage "whoso controls our subsistence controls us." Slavery is commonly thought of as ownership of one man by another. But

1963

just the opposite of what Kennedy has promised day in and day out for more than 2 years: tough talk and no action.

To critics, Government apologists offer a now monotonous answer: "What should be done? You tell us." This is the ultimate admission of defeat. Who outside the Government can have access to all the strings of information and analysis that would go toward making such a decision? What is the job of those in office except to make such decisions and take action accordingly?

From the day of President Kennedy's inauguration, there were three obvious ways to oust Castro and his regime: invasion, economic blockade, internal revolt. Failure of nerve undermined the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961 when air cover was called off; failure of nerve negated the blockade last October when the Navy was ordered to let oil tankers through the cordon; and, now, failure of nerve is canceling the final alternative, the basis for which would have to be the supply of arms and ammunition to insurrectionary groups inside the island.

Despite all the failures, however, a basic Cuban policy had been thrashed out in Washington over the past 4 years. Its goals were: to work actively to overthrow the Castro government and, in the interim period, to block the spread of the Castroist disease in the rest of the hemisphere. The more important half of this program has now been jettisoned, and Washington's word for 1963 is "isolation." But there should be no mistake about it: isolation means nothing more or less than coexistence. Castro is here to stay.

This is a near tragic mistake, a mistake foisted on the Government by the legions of doom criers who preach a doctrine of paralysis based on fear of atomic war. Whenever a voice of reason is raised—that the Kremlin will not start a war for the same reasons that we will not—the apocalyptic racket becomes deafening. So we cannot step on Mr. Khrushchev's Cuban toe.

Cuba today is seething with unrest, its economy in tatters, its people sullen and angry. The sugar harvest, the wellspring of Cuban fortunes, is lower than it has been in a decade. An island paradise that once boasted the highest standard of living in Latin America now rations food, clothing, and even soap. Monitored broadcasts of Castro's own radio admit executions, food riots, mass arrests, and counterrevolutionary fighting in the hills. And suddenly, the United States intervenes on Castro's side.

The running of guns to Cuban revolutionary movements has been going on for 60 years while Washington looked the other way. It is the time-honored method of getting rid of Cuban tyrants, the method used by Castro himself. Now, when for the first time in those 60 years the tyrant is a Communist, the U.S. Government changes the rules, even earning a thank you from Castro himself.

Throughout the world the Communists are spreading the message that they represent the wave of the future. In Cuba today, and only in Cuba, the United States has the golden opportunity to give the lie to Communist boasting by breaking off a piece of the Red bloc and restoring it to freedom. With that prize in reach—in fact sitting in its lap—the Kennedy administration decides that the risk isn't worth the candle. It will coexist with Castro.

The Cuban dictatorship is held together by force; the only way it ever will be taken apart is by counterforce. For the United States not to face up to this responsibility—and opportunity—is to betray its history dating back to the Monroe Doctrine, its present-day hemisphere commitments and alliances, and its future role of world leadership.

Another Forward Step

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I want to express my sincere gratification at the passage of H.R. 5389, the administration's much-needed silver legislation. And to take this opportunity to congratulate all those who helped bring this about.

As Congressman-at-Large from the State of Connecticut, I am privileged to represent an area wherein some 22 establishments are engaged in the use and fabrication of silver as silver products and platedware employing approximately 6,000 employees. The payroll in 1958 for about 3,947 employees was \$19,196,000. The value of shipments out of Connecticut in 1958 was \$67,186,000 with a value added of \$34,621,000. While this figure would be subject to modification because of the impossibility of differentiating out nonsilver products of these producers, the modification would be smaller for Connecticut than the Nation due to the location in Connecticut of such companies as the International Silver Co., Wallace Silversmiths, and Handy & Harmon Co., manufacturers of brazing alloys, silver paint, and silver contacts, and so forth, used in defense production; companies which produce the lion's share of such silver products for the entire country.

During the course of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee, I was privileged to confer at length with Mr. Douglas Dillon, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. John B. Stevens, vice president and general manager of the International Silver Co., and many representatives of mining and producing interests both from Connecticut and other areas. But early in these hearings, I came to believe sincerely that such legislation is in the best interest of the Nation as a whole for many reasons.

Mr. Speaker, although it is not usually my practice to introduce printed testimony in my remarks, I should like to present the following excerpts as I believe that they very appropriately present the questions in a suitably brief and easily understandable form.

First, I would like to quote from the testimony of Mr. Dillon as contained in the "Hearings Before the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 1st session, on H.R. 4413." His statements, I think aptly present the need for and purpose of this legislation:

Basic purposes of legislation: H.R. 4413 implements the recommendations of the President, going back to his instruction to me in November 1961 to suspend further sales of silver, and repeated in his Economic Report in January of this year. Its basic purposes are twofold:

(1) To afford the Government a sure

and substantial supply of silver for its coinage needs by making available for this purpose the stocks of silver bullion backing the presently outstanding \$1 silver certificates. This amounts to approximately 1,300 million ounces.

(2) To eliminate the obsolete and largely inoperative provisions on the statute books requiring the acquisition and holding of silver in our monetary reserves and putting a Government floor price of 90.5 cents an ounce under newly mined domestic silver, which is far below the current market price.

For many years now silver has not served any major purpose as a monetary reserve metal. While it has been held as a reserve behind outstanding silver certificates, the amount of these in relation to total currency in circulation is small (approximately \$2 billion in silver certificates, compared with \$30 billion in Federal Reserve notes). Our basic currency is the Federal Reserve note which is backed by 100 percent collateral, 25 percent in the form of gold.

Recent years have seen a sharply increasing worldwide demand for silver for industrial, professional, and artistic uses which is in marked contrast to the situation existing in 1934 when the Silver Purchase Act was passed and in subsequent years up to about 1959.

Today, silver is at a point where current world production is not sufficient to meet current coinage and industrial demands. Most recently, annual free world production of newly mined silver has amounted to about 200 million ounces, compared to a consumption of around 350 million ounces.

Since November 29, 1961, we have been retiring the \$5 and \$10 silver certificates, replacing them with Federal Reserve notes, and utilizing the silver so released for the coinage of subsidiary coins, but this supply is limited. Coinage requirements appear to be increasing each year, partly at least as a result of the ever-growing use of vending machines. Last year they amounted to about 75 million ounces.

In addition, our increasing population leads to a steady growth in the number of \$1 bills required for circulation. Since at present \$1 bills can only be issued in the form of silver certificates, this leads to a further annual requirement, which last year amounted to \$49 million, or roughly 38 million ounces.

Problems arising if \$1 Federal note not authorized: If the \$1 Federal Reserve note is not authorized, the Treasury will soon be in the untenable position of being forced into the market to buy silver for its coinage needs. Since U.S. production is only one-third of our industrial requirements, all silver for coinage would have to be acquired from abroad, thus putting an unnecessary strain on our balance of payments.

The next excerpt, from a statement by Rear Adm. Donald J. Ramsey, U.S. Navy, retired, is of value because it dispels, I think, some longstanding misconceptions I have noted regarding the intrinsic monetary value of silver.

Silver as money: The act of March 14, 1900, established the gold dollar as our standard unit of value. The Gold Reserve Act guarantees an ounce of gold will exchange for \$35. Silver was actually demonetized in 1873 and is not a standard unit of value. It has no guaranteed value despite the use in various laws of such words as "standard silver dollars," "monetary value," "seigniorage," and so forth.

Despite the 40-percent increase in the price of silver during the last 15 months, domestic mine production of recoverable silver rose less than 5 percent in 1962.

April 23

In fact, mine production in Nevada, Utah, and Washington declined. The gain in Arizona silver production reflects greater output of copper ore yielding byproducts of silver. An increase in the price of silver does not mean an increase in production because silver is largely a byproduct in the production of copper, lead, and zinc. These base metals are in oversupply.

Annual consumption of silver in the United States is now averaging 105 million ounces. A few large producers account for most of the 35 million ounces of domestic production. Approximately 40 percent of this production comes from ore mined primarily for its silver content—mostly in Idaho. The remaining 60 percent comes incidentally in the production of copper, lead and zinc.

It should always be borne in mind that foreign producers greatly benefit by our silver policies. Two-thirds of our annual consumption now comes from abroad. Such purchases amount to about 70 million ounces a year which result in a claim against our gold supply of about \$90 million.

Secretary Dillon stated that the silver producing industry has no further need for Government assistance. He pointed out that since late 1961 the producers have seen a spectacular increase in the price of their product amounting to about 40 percent. He stated that the recent rapid rise has created difficulties for the users, who have had to cope as best they can with these increased costs.

Mr. John B. Stevens, vice president and general manager of the International Silver Co., Meriden, Conn., said before the House Banking and Currency Committee:

I do not feel qualified to discuss the monetary aspects of silver, but I would like to confine myself to what I understand—silver as a raw material."

In his economic report of January 1963, President Kennedy said:

I again urge a revision in our silver policy to reflect the status of silver as a metal for which there is an expanding industrial demand.

A year earlier President Kennedy said:

It is uneconomic for the U.S. Government to lock up large quantities of useful silver in the sterile form of currency reserves.

This I understand and applaud because silver is the single most important raw material which the International Silver Co. buys. In a single year we use over 4 million ounces in our silver-plated and sterling silver products. Silver is, of course, the largest component in the cost of sterling silver products and a surprisingly large element in the cost of silverplate. For example, at the present price of silver bullion of \$1.27 an ounce, the silver content comprises 75 percent of the manufacturing cost of sterling silver knives, forks and spoons, and 60 percent of the cost of sterling silver holloware, which is the trade name for coffee pots, teapots, candlesticks, bowls, trays, platters, and so forth. Even in silverplate such as the famous 1847 Rogers Bros., the silver content is 20 percent of the manufacturing cost of knives, forks and spoons.

What this means in terms of selling prices is that the retail price of a typical five-piece sterling place setting, including the 10-percent excise tax, has had to be increased from \$32.50 to \$39.50 as a result of the increase in the price of silver which has taken place in the last year alone, if we are to maintain current profit margins. The retail price of a sterling teapot has had to be increased from \$145.75 to \$182.

When one considers the essential uses of silver in defense production as well as in less critical products such as silver-zinc batteries, alloys and solders, dental and medical uses, electrical controls, contacts and circuits, and mirrors, and so forth, and the smaller, less diversified companies dependent upon moderate price margins for survival, the price of the raw material assumes a greater significance. This last excerpt from a statement by Mr. C. Edwin Ireland, vice president and treasurer, Hamilton Watch Co., on behalf of Wallace Silver-Smiths, points up some of these difficulties:

Our company buys about 2 million ounces of silver annually. The sudden increase in the price of silver has therefore added, quite unexpectedly, about \$700,000 to our manufacturing costs. To state the situation bluntly, our profit expectations have been substantially lessened.

The question might properly be asked that if the entire industry is faced with the same increase in the cost of raw materials would not an industrywide price increase in the cost of the finished product pass the burden on to the consumer and reserve the profits for the manufacturer. Unfortunately, it just isn't that easy.

Changing our prices, once a year, in a period of rising costs can be handled. Changing prices twice a year in unusual circumstances can be tolerated. To do so more often is impossible.

Because of the wild fluctuations in the cost of our raw material, it is impossible to quickly adjust our selling prices to recover the added costs and still be competitive. In any industry, a price change normally entails careful forecasts of raw material costs based on past, current and anticipated cost levels. With most raw materials, forecasts can be made within reasonable degrees of accuracy. With silver, it is impossible under present conditions. As a result, we find ourselves continually in need of price adjustments to recover, at least in part, the fluctuating cost of silver.

With continued upward and unpredictable fluctuations in the silver market, together with consequent increases in our product selling prices, our retail customers are confused and wary as to their purchasing policy. In general, they are restricting their purchases awaiting some clarification to emerge from which they can gain some assurance of normalcy.

We believe that the price of silver will become far more stable and predictable if it is freed from all artificial controls and supports and is permitted to react to the normal pressures and influences of a free, competitive market. As we understand it, there was no shortage in

the supply of silver during 1962 and that all industrial requirements were satisfactorily met from regular suppliers of the commodity. If this is true, then we cannot believe that the elementary law of supply and demand was permitted to operate in that period. In our opinion, there is no other way to explain a 38-percent increase in price when there was no shortage in supply.

As we interpret the effects of H.R. 4413, silver will find its own proper price level as a commodity. To make this possible, it seems to us of great importance that the bill be passed in its entirety. The Secretary of the Treasury must not be required to enter the market for artificial reasons. At the same time, the 50-percent transfer tax must be eliminated so that buyers and sellers can operate normally, and without penalty, in a free market.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone to more length here than I ordinarily would, but so strongly do I feel passage of this legislation to be in the national interest, that I wanted to acquaint as many as possible with the subject matter of the bill. I am also going to urge the two U.S. Senators from Connecticut, Senators THOMAS J. DODD and ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, to give this proposal careful consideration when it comes up in the Senate. Not only would it aid Connecticut industry, but also strengthen the United States by placing somewhat less reliance upon foreign producers for our silver, at least as far as U.S. coinage is concerned.

Bonneville Now Losing Millions Annually—Wants Larger Area To Lose More In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1963, the House adjourned for an Easter recess to meet again on April 22, 1963. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 11, 1963, I placed the fourth of a series of editorials from newspapers published in the State of Idaho. These editorials were highly critical of the proposal to extend the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. I advised my colleagues that the series of editorials would be resumed after the Easter recess. Today I am inserting the fifth of the series of newspaper editorials or articles relative to the desire of Bonneville Power Administration, which is now losing millions annually, for a larger area to lose more in.

I have been reliably informed that Secretary Udall has on his desk an order extending the Bonneville power marketing area into southern Idaho. The issuance of such an order, so I am told, only awaits a propitious political moment for two of its sponsors, the senior Senator and the senior Congressman from Idaho.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I have been attending a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, and I have come into the Chamber just now. I understand the Senator is speaking about the recommendations which he made to the North Atlantic Parliamentarians' Conference. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask that I be granted 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Senator from New York be extended for 2 additional minutes, without it being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. In response to the question of the Senator from California I would say that we have actually organized the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America. It has been financed. It is enthusiastically backed by all elements of the economy in Western Europe, the United States and Latin America. We are at work on drafting a plan under which this kind of investment from Europe, in association with the United States and Latin America, may be forthcoming. We have a target of a billion dollars a year. As I said a moment ago, I know it can be done. The only question is whether we can do it. I know it can be done.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise to pay a deserved tribute to the Senator from New York. The Alliance for Progress is of importance to the people of the United States, because a part of our destiny is historically and naturally intertwined with our neighbors in Latin America. It is also of supreme importance to members of the Atlantic Community. I well remember, because I was a delegate to that conference with the Senator from New York, the enthusiasm with which his original recommendations were received by our parliamentary colleagues representing the nations of NATO.

What he has said means that the NATO nations will share our own interest in keeping the South American countries free and share the burdens which the U.S. Government have undertaken.

I salute the Senator from New York for his excellent statesmanship in the fruition of the recommendations which he made last fall in Paris.

Mr. JAVITS. I express my gratitude to the Senator from California and also my thanks for his indispensable help in Paris and here in the continuing development of this project.

I also wish to add my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is Chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have kept him informed on what we were doing. He was most generous in helping me with respect to this subject.

I am indeed grateful to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] for his fine support and for the splendid endorsement which he has given to this work.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the previous unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the senior Senator from Oregon may be permitted to proceed for 25 minutes and that at the conclusion of his statement the junior Senator from New York, [Mr. KEATING], may proceed for about 3 minutes, without any of this time being charged to either side on the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MR. NIXON AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Saturday night the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the American public were treated to a replay of the old Nixon theme song. It made use of all the same old techniques of forensic deceit that have come to be so closely associated with Mr. Nixon. "If only I were the 'partisan type,'" he began, "what a field day I could have." One cannot help wondering whether Mr. Nixon meant the chuckles to come at his characterization of himself or at his characterization of the administration's record. Certainly Mr. Nixon holds some kind of unofficial title in this country as a champion partisan infighter, and it is unbelievable that he meant the description of himself to be taken seriously.

But just in case anyone might have any question of this man's ability to deceive himself with words, even when his audience remains undecieved, we are then treated to the shopworn and transparent tactic of making a charge by denying that the charge is being made. "Nor do I charge that this administration is trying to appease Mr. Khrushchev," says Nixon. "Nor do I charge that because of the failure of the economy to grow as fast as was predicted when the administration came into office we are in deadly peril of being outproduced by the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc."

How often we have heard in years past that old verbal technique. It carried Richard Nixon a little further than it carried Joe McCarthy, but not much further. I would have more respect for the man if he made these charges honestly and straight out, instead of disguising them with pious semantics.

But the old refrain from this speech of Saturday that really strikes a chord of

memory is the Nixon prescription of how to deal with Cuba. Nixon on Cuba in 1963 is nothing more nor less than the 1952 Republican prescription for dealing with China. "The more things change, the more they are the same," according to the French proverb. Richard Nixon is the living proof of the truth and applicability of that axiom to the policies of the modern Republican Party.

The Nixon prescription for Cuba, like the 1952 Republican prescription for China, consists largely in big talk and easy promises of liberating both these victims of communism. The "activist" quality in both cases is remarkably similar. Eleven years ago, we heard about how China would be freed by "unleashing" Chiang Kai-shek; Saturday night, we heard that Cuba is to be freed by "unleashing" the Cuban exiles.

During the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, it must be presumed that Chiang Kai-shek was indeed "unleashed." One cannot be sure because not much of anything happened, except that after a few years, all expectation that Chiang's forces would actually invade the mainland of China disappeared.

Those expectations disappeared when it became evident that the forces to be unleashed were not to be the real forces which would have to carry the brunt of the battle. It finally became perfectly clear even to the most gullible that putting Chiang's forces into battle against the Chinese Communists would require vast American air and sea support, and that unless those Nationalist forces were to be abandoned to their fate, a full-scale American invasion in support of them would be necessary.

The question that Mr. Nixon raises in my mind is whether this is not what he really has in mind in Cuba. The principal element of his Cuban policy is that the Cuban exiles in this country not be "leashed." Instead, he calls for open support of what he calls, but fails to define, "forces of freedom." It is his recommendation that we openly support forces organized to overthrow a Communist-controlled government in the Western Hemisphere.

On the face of it, Mr. Nixon is calling for official violation by the U.S. Government of its laws against participation by residents in this country, either citizens or noncitizens, in attacks, raids, or invasions of any kind aimed at nations with which we are not at war. Perhaps Mr. Nixon had it in mind that he believes those laws should be changed and just did not spell it out.

But even so, what he is really advocating is a program of aid to the Cuban exiles that would bring the military power of the United States into play sooner or later on their behalf. It would be either that, or repetitions of the Bay of Pigs, because financing, organizing, and training the Cuban exiles was not enough even in 1961.

The Cuban exiles were unleashed for some 3 years. The results were nothing more than nuisance raids that were followed by attacks on U.S. shipping. The following is a résumé of the raids by the Cuban exiles and their results:

6406

August 24, 1962, First raid, Revolutionary Student Directorate Group shelled hotel on Havana waterfront causing minor damage.

September 10, 1962: Five-man crew from Alpha-66 group fired on a United Kingdom vessel and a Cuban vessel near Cayo-Frances causing slight damage to both vessels.

October 8, 1962: Estimated 10-man party representing Alpha-66 staged raid on harbor installation at Isabela de Sagua causing undetermined number of casualties.

October 12, 1962: A six-man party under the direction of Manolo Quiza machinegunned a Cuban vessel in the sea area off the port of Cardenas. The vessel was reportedly sunk and two of the four crew members were injured.

December 4, 1962: Several dozen raiders, representing the second front of the Escambray, in two small craft fired on installations in the port of Caibarien.

March 17, 1963: Vessel carrying small number of raiders representing Alpha-66 and the second Escambray front raided the harbor at Isabela de Sagua causing minor damage to the Soviet freighter *L' Gov*. There may have been casualties.

March 26, 1963: An estimated six raiders representing the L-66 group attacked the Soviet vessel *Baku* in the harbor of Caibarien. Substantial damage was caused to the Soviet vessel.

SUMMARY

Cuban exiles have carried out seven hit-and-run pinprick raids against Cuba beginning with the attack on a Havana waterfront hotel in late August 1962. These attacks in the main were improvised and with the exception of the last attack on a Soviet vessel caused virtually no damage.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will yield when I finish my speech; then I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. President, is this Mr. Nixon's idea of how Cuba is to be liberated? Surely he knows it would require not merely U.S. sea and air support, but the presence of large numbers of U.S. troops to make any invasion of Cuba a success.

Mr. Nixon thinks he has shrewdly avoided making that bald assertion to the American people. His speech to the editors is carefully worded to give the promise of freeing Cuba without giving the price in American blood that would have to be paid for it under his policy. "Unleash the Cuban exiles," cries Nixon. But there is an unspoken corollary that is fully known and appreciated by Mr. Nixon, even if it was not uttered by him. It is that a continuation of the exile raids and eventual landings of exiles in Cuba would require massive American participation to make them successful.

The American Nation has registered its rejection of these intellectual dishonesties of Richard Nixon. I suspect that the disillusionment with the unleashing of the Chinese Nationalists will put this newest "unleashing" shell game into its proper perspective. For the plain truth is that in either case, the unleashing would be nothing more than a vanguard

to full-scale U.S. invasion. I think the American people know that. They did not want any part of that kind of policy toward China, and I do not believe they are any more interested in such a policy toward Cuba.

"UNLEASHED" POLICY HAS ALREADY FAILED

They might be, were it not for the very fact which Nixon brings up in support of his own case. It is that the Cuban exiles cannot be expected to carry alone the brunt of opposition to the Soviet power which has been planted in Cuba.

Mr. Nixon says this is why we should openly support the exiles. But it also means that only the U.S. military power can successfully challenge the Communist power in Cuba. The exiles have already had the benefit of U.S. open support extending to financial aid, training, weapons, and transport. The Bay of Pigs was the result. Even if Soviet troops were not still present in Cuba, the Cuban exiles could not do any better now than in 1961 without American troops to help them. In my judgment, they could not do it nearly so well. If Nixon is advocating a U.S. invasion, why does he not say so to the American people with intellectual honesty? The policy he outlined must eventually bring about American military involvement in Cuba. He knows that. Why does Nixon persist in believing that all the American people can be fooled all of the time?

I have said many times from the Senate floor that I do not rule out the possibility of American military involvement in Cuba. We saw it occur last October, when there was a direct threat to American national security. We may again have to protect the security of the Western Hemisphere from the Cuban threat with the use of our military power.

I repeat again, as I have said several times from this desk and many times from the platforms of America, that the American people have every reason to place complete confidence in the purpose of the President of the United States to proceed immediately, at any critical moment, to protect the security of this Republic whenever its security is challenged or endangered by either Castro or Khrushchev or both acting jointly.

The President has also made it clear that he intends to keep this Republic within the framework of international law. However, the speech by Richard Nixon the other night was a warmongering speech which would have taken us outside the framework of international law had we carried out Nixon's proposal.

I thank my God that sitting in the White House is a man who recognizes the sacred, solemn responsibilities of being President of the United States, and the duty to keep this Republic within the framework of international law. This President recognizes that an aggressor course of action or a violation of American-signed treaties or a violation of our responsibilities to international law cannot be justified in maintaining our efforts in the realm of freedom around the world.

If we sought to implement the aggressor course of action, which was the very essence of the Nixon proposal the other day, we would lose one ally after another

in the United Nations, because we have a duty in this era of civilization to see to it that we do not follow a course of action of international outlawry. In essence, the proposals of Nixon the other night were proposals that this country should become a party to international outlawry. If he was aware of the treaties the United States has signed, he ignored them in the preparation of the speech he delivered the other day when he spoke to the newspaper editors.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of allowing the United States to be drawn into military involvement on behalf of or because of the Cuban exiles. Neither am I in favor of a U.S. policy which uses the Cuban exiles as a front, and as an excuse for American involvement. Let not the Cuban exiles forget that possibility, either. The refugees here in the United States account for only some 4 percent of the people of Cuba. Ninety-six percent of the Cuban people are still in Cuba.

I am not in favor of keeping this relatively small percentage of its people on a string to use as a convenient pretext for an American invasion of Cuba. After Cuba, what? British Guiana? Brazil? There are voices in America right now who will swear that the Government of Brazil and the Government of Venezuela are both Communist-dominated.

The extreme right in this country should leave no room for doubt on the part of the thinking people of the country that they want war. They represent the war party of America. I believe that the challenge of statesmanship these days is to try, first, to win the fight against communism on the basis of bloodless combat. We will shed our blood if it ever becomes necessary to do so to protect the security of this Republic. But I am one Senator who does not intend to sweep under the rug attacks such as the one from Nixon the other night. I believe the people must be warned at all times against the dangerous propaganda of the warmongers, such as Nixon, who seek to poison the thinking of the American people by waving the American flag into tatters. As a patriotic American, I do not believe we pay due respect to the American flag by waving it into tatters.

I do not want to see any return to the unilateral American policy of deciding when a government of Latin America is to be overthrown in furtherance of U.S. interests. That is what Mr. Nixon is calling for. It would be a return to the 19th century diplomacy which made the United States a hated nation in the hemisphere and did damage which has required half a century to repair.

U.S. ALREADY AIDING NON-COMMUNIST GOVERNMENTS

A part of Mr. Nixon's prescription for Latin America is for open U.S. support of those same "forces of freedom" in nations threatened by Communist activity. But we have such a policy in full force and effect right now. The Punta del Este conference of a year and a half ago, to which I had the honor to be one of the two Senate delegates, the other being the distinguished Senator from

Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], spelled out some of the steps to be taken by all our governments to curb Communist activities and influences in the nations of the hemisphere. A large part of that policy includes the careful and effective patrolling of the waters of the Caribbean by American forces to prevent the smuggling of arms, propaganda, and trained personnel from Cuba into other Latin American countries.

We send them large amounts of military aid to maintain internal security. Another large part of this policy is the Alliance for Progress itself.

In short, I simply do not know what Mr. Nixon is talking about when he says we should openly support the forces of freedom in countries where internal communism is threatening. We are doing it now. Let me say, parenthetically, that Brazil is one of the most important of these; yet Mr. Nixon derided our aid to Brazil. It is hard to see just what kind of "open support" he would have us extend to Brazil, to keep communism from advancing in that country, if he considers our present massive aid to be a mistake.

There is one more point in Mr. Nixon's Cuba policy which I should like to mention. It is that when asked for specifics of what action the United States should take to oust communism from that country, he declined to name any that are not already being undertaken. He thus left the exiles as the "front" for his American involvement, when he could have spelled out the desirability of supporting their invasion of Cuba with American forces—which in my judgment is the proposal that is concealed and imbedded in his program. But he was not intellectually honest enough to tell the American people what he really meant. The specific actions mentioned by Nixon are now being taken by the Kennedy administration, to remove the Soviet presence in Cuba, and eventually the Communist presence—political methods, political pressures, and economic pressures.

We should, said Mr. Nixon, begin with the minimum steps, and see what result they bring, before stepping up what we do. It is too bad that Nixon is not willing to find out what results these methods bring. It will surely take many more months before we know whether they are effective or not. But he wants to unleash the exiles, too, with all that implies.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Latin-American Affairs Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and as one who for years has been steeped in the problems of the United States vis-a-vis Latin America, let me say, that in my judgment the proposals made the other night by Mr. Nixon would cause catastrophe throughout Latin America and would end in war. As I have said before, in my judgment, statesmanship calls for us with honor to do everything we can to win a bloodless victory over communism in Latin America, although ready at all times to shed our blood in whatever amounts may be necessary in order to protect the security of our country in

case Castro and Khrushchev follow an aggressive course of action against the Western Hemisphere. We must not forget the the Act of Punta del Este pledges all the free nations of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States and our Latin American neighbors, to support each other whenever there is a violation of international law by an aggressive course of action on the part of Cuba and its master, Khrushchev.

It is always hard to tell whether Mr. Nixon advocates a move of this kind because it sounds like a good, cheap way of gaining something all Americans desire without ever having to put it to the test, or whether he advocates this particular policy with the full knowledge that effectuating it would bring about tremendous consequences for the American people, consequences he deliberately fails to mention or discuss.

Fortunately, the American people have decided that they do not want to find out what he has in mind. They made that clear in November 1960.

EUROPEAN POLICY COSTLY, DANGEROUS

In some ways, Mr. Nixon's outline of a policy toward our NATO allies was much more far-reaching and ominous than his Cuban policy, and deserved more attention in the press, than what he said about Cuba. Mr. Nixon would, in Western Europe, have us fall back on the Republican theory of diplomacy which calls for arming every nation to the teeth as a means of avoiding war. That was the Dulles policy, and Nixon is apparently ready to carry it to a fatal extreme.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I opposed the Dulles program during the last 3 or 4 years of his leadership in the State Department. In my judgment, we are still suffering terrible consequences because of the misconceptions inherent in the Dulles program.

The way to repair the Atlantic alliance, says Mr. Nixon, is to give our NATO partners nuclear weapons. He calls for a change in the Atomic Energy Act that would permit "the transfer of a limited number of nuclear warheads for the appropriate use of our European allies."

Is General De Gaulle unhappy because France does not have its own national nuclear forces? Then give him some, says Mr. Nixon. What interest of the United States this conceivably could serve, Nixon does not say. From the context of his remarks it appears that he simply wants to give our allies in Europe anything they want, to keep them happy and quiet. I do not see where Nixon even expects Europe to pay for those nuclear warheads, since he calls for their "transfer," not their sale.

I find it especially surprising that Nixon should offer such a proposal when he also calls for a move toward greater political unity within NATO. He urges, in fact, a "confederation" to permit unified political control of the NATO organization. Giving France, Britain, and Germany—to start with—nuclear weapons of their own is exactly the opposite of leading them toward greater political unity.

Mr. President, here is one Senator who

never will vote a dime to a NATO country for the development of a national atomic, nuclear-weapons program. Here is one Senator who will insist that, for the preservation of civilization itself, we continue to maintain control of nuclear power, under international agreements with our allies. Here is one Senator who repeats his statement made from this desk on January 16—namely, that he does not intend to see the United States help or aid De Gaulle in any way in his program to make France an independent nuclear power.

We cannot run the risk of encouraging individual nations to develop individual national nuclear weapons programs, if we are still to have any hope of preserving the peace in our time. Certainly we have great moral obligations to the next generation and to future generations of Americans.

If Mr. Nixon were genuinely interested in a closer political unity and control over the NATO military forces, I cannot imagine that he would also propose to destroy that unity by setting up each member as an independent nuclear power. The kindest thing I can think of Nixon's proposal is that he is resorting to the practice of trying to "buy off" unwilling or recalcitrant partners.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The time available to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am flatly opposed to any amendment of the Atomic Energy Act which would permit the transfer, the sale, or any other placing of nuclear warheads in the hands of other nations, for their own use. If Mr. Nixon is sincere in seeking a closer political relationship with our European allies, let him begin talking about changes in the Atomic Energy Act that would release to a purely NATO organization some degree of American control.

There is plenty of room for negotiation and maneuvering over how to bring about better relations within NATO. But, by and large, I believe that among nations which are basically friendly, basically democratic, and have the same basic objectives, a reasonably straight line is the best one to follow in trying to reach agreement. There may be some complex rationale behind his idea that the way to move toward unity is to fractionalize. If so, Mr. Nixon has a lot more explaining to do.

Mr. President, I close by saying, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that in my judgment the balance between war and peace in the world today is a very delicate one; and, in my judgment, there will not be any little wars. If we start a war in Cuba, we shall very likely start a world war. I think the leaders of all nations should recognize that.

Therefore, whenever the warmongers seek to spread their poisonous propaganda of war—as Mr. Nixon did the

6108

other day, before the newspaper editors—irrespective of the political consequences, I will take to this floor in defense of trying to reach an honorable peace and in defense of the great foreign policy program of a great President, President Kennedy.

The time has come to make perfectly clear to the warmongers that the American people are entitled to the facts. They are entitled to intellectual honesty. They are entitled to be protected from the kind of deceit in which Mr. Nixon engaged in his shocking speech to the newspaper editors.

I say to the newspaper editors, You, too, have a patriotic obligation to keep faith with the first amendment of the Constitution, and, in the exercise of your precious guarantee of free speech, to present to the American people the facts about foreign policy, and not permit warmongers to give to the American people the big dose of intellectual poison and war propaganda that Mr. Nixon gave to your conference when he spoke the other day.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the fine analysis of the Cuban policy by Mr. Walter Lippmann, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KENNEDY-KEATING CUBAN POLICY
 (By Walter Lippmann)

Cuba got a good airing last week before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and the significant fact about the speeches of the President, Secretary Rusk, and Senator KEATING was that there is substantial agreement about what the United States should and should not do. It is hard to say what Mr. Nixon's Cuban policy would be. He sounded like a man who was ready to go to war. But all he actually said was that he wanted the Cuban exiles to make hit-and-run raids.

Senator KEATING, who is the most conspicuous of the critical opposition, began by saying that it is foolish to pretend that there are easy answers to the Cuban problem. He did not pretend. Then in the course of his speech he admitted that he agrees with the main theses of our present Cuban policy. He is opposed to an invasion. He is opposed to a blockade. He is opposed to hit-and-run raids mounted from American soil. He is in favor of greater stress on nonmilitary measures, and he wants to exert increasing economic pressure so that the Soviets will be driven to the conclusion that the price of maintaining a base in Cuba is too high.

This is the same story which the administration is telling. Senator KEATING's differences are not in the substance of the text but in the editing, the typography, the layout, and the captions. The Senator, like the President, excludes in present circumstances the resort to war—invasion, blockade, and raiding; like the President, he, too, would deal with Cuba by surveillance, containment, isolation, economic pressures, and propaganda.

There is no doubt that at least for some time to come the Kennedy-Keating policy will leave the Soviet troops 90 miles from Florida. This is an affront to our pride. Not since Napoleon III put French troops into Mexico to enthrone and support the Emperor Maximilian has anything like this happened so close to us. In the end the

French troops went away. But, because there was no prudent alternative, Lincoln put up with the Bonapartist troops for several years.

How long must we put up with the Russian troops? The honest answer is that we must put up with them until they can be gotten rid of by measures short of nuclear war. Here is the sticking point in the argument with Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon. They sound, they intend to sound, as if they know a way to get rid of the Russian troops promptly without waging nuclear war.

What is this prompter way to make the Russians go away from Cuba? They do not tell us, but the most reasonable interpretation of what they say is that the prompter way is not to make war but to threaten war. Both Governor Rockefeller and Mr. Nixon have avoided saying plainly what they do mean. But if what they sound like has genuine meaning it is that they believe the United States can deliver an ultimatum which the Soviet Union will bow to.

If this is not what they mean, what in the name of common sense do they mean with all their big words? If they are prepared to be so bold with the Russians, they ought to be bold enough to talk plainly to their fellow Americans.

The Rockefeller-Nixon position appears then to be that Cuba can be liberated by ordering the Soviet Union to withdraw from this hemisphere, and to stand by passively while we blockade Castro and arrange for a replacement of Castro's government. If this is what they have in mind, they are making an enormous guess. For nobody can possibly know that the Soviet Union would surrender its whole position in Cuba as it surrendered its offensive weapons last October. It is the supreme folly in the nuclear age to drive a nuclear power into a corner. And if the Soviet Union refused to bow to the ultimatum, all this would do for us would be to make us look like fools.

The President of the United States cannot play with an ultimatum to a government like that of the Soviet Union. He cannot use an ultimatum unless he is prepared to go through with it and begin a war. If he is not prepared to go to war, an ultimatum is a bluff and everyone will soon see that it is.

While the present policy does not promise a quick withdrawal of the Russians or the fall of Castro, it is surely not true to say that it is complacent do-nothingism. To a degree which is just short of war Cuba is being photographed, patrolled, embargoed and squeezed, and isolated. If Cuba were a great power, we would be at war with her for what we are already doing. I doubt whether there is any precedent where we have exerted such strong measures short of war on any other country.

However much we are impatient and frustrated we have to grasp the fact that Cuba is no military threat to the United States and is not very much of a threat to Latin America. The worst of Castro is his example and a long way after that such agents as he is able to train and infiltrate into the Latin American countries. He is an affront to our pride, he is a nuisance, he is a mischiefmaker. But he is not a mortal threat to the vital interests of the United States, and therefore, in this age of thermonuclear war, we must deal with him by measures that are short of war.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the American people are a peace-loving

people. The Government of the United States joined the United Nations because we believe in peace. We continue to seek peace with justice and with honor in this world.

I believe the American people understand the ugly and dread hazard to the free way of life which is posed by international communism. For that reason again this year the representatives of the American people will vote to spend, in round numbers, approximately \$100 billion to perfect our Defense Establishment and further to sophisticate the defensive weapons of obliteration which modern science and technology have brought not only to the free nations, but also to the nations under the yoke of international communism.

The American people are bitter. They object to the transformation of Cuba into a Communist satellite. Their own feelings were reflected only a year ago on the floor of the Senate when it adopted the following resolution:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States is determined—

(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

(b) to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination.

That resolution was approved by the Congress and likewise by the President of the United States. I think it fair to say that it represents basic American policy. Our country will never permit Cuba to become a nuclear or an offensive launching pad; and, to the everlasting credit of the President of the United States, the action which he took last October indicated that our Cuban policy was to be vindicated on that occasion.

But the American people continue to be bitter. They continue to urge the American Government to take any action that can be taken to isolate and, under the very terms of the resolution, to extirpate from the Western Hemisphere communism in any form.

I receive letters from people in California upon occasion demanding action. I have written replies to those letters in which I have said, "What do you mean when you say 'action'? If you are demanding that I use my vote and my voice upon this occasion now, immediately, to demand a military invasion of Cuba, you are wrong, because I will not do that."

Neither will the American people. The President of the United States has said, "We have fought wars before." And now we face, God forbid, a continuing hazard of an obliterating nuclear war. Nevertheless the American people intend that they and their Government proceed with honor and courage and vigor, and firmness with respect to communism in this hemisphere and in any other clime around this globe.

1963

"Deeds not words," was the Eisenhower phrase. It still goes.

Mr. President, I did not read the text of the comments of former Vice President Nixon, and therefore I cannot comment very well upon the points which my able friend from Oregon has raised.

There is no more vigorous advocate in the Senate than my colleague the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. When I propose a measure which is controversial, I am always happy when my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] is on my side and agrees with me.

I take the floor of the Senate on this occasion to say that from the newspaper accounts of former Vice President Nixon's speech, I do not consider it a "shocking" speech. In my judgment his speech reflected the uneasiness of the American people with respect to the continuing presence in Cuba, 90 miles off our shore, of a Communist ideology. They hope and pray—I go further than that when I say they demand—that our Government do everything that can be done to isolate and eventually to eliminate that hazard from our way of life.

Former Vice President Nixon is an American. He did not attack President Kennedy as an appeaser. He simply presented his views with vigor to an audience of newspaper editors which extended an invitation to him to speak on the occasion of their convention.

I say very frankly to my friend from Oregon that, when the President of the United States the other day approved a loan to Brazil I did not denounce that loan. But I say to him most sincerely that I desire more facts with respect to the reasonableness of that loan before I place my own personal stamp of approval upon it. We must remember that a few weeks ago the State Department publicly said that Communists were working their will in the government of Brazil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. A couple of days later the State Department said that Communists did not dominate Brazil. As an American citizen I say that if Brazil went down the Communist drain, it would be another body blow to the cause of freedom. We do not want our hemisphere to go Communist. For that reason, I shall continue to support the Alliance for Progress. I desire that our ties with our Latin American neighbors be strong. I wish to see us go forward in helping those countries eliminate many of the causes for communism—ill health, poverty, illiteracy, poor housing, lack of widespread individual landownership, sickness, and disease. But I do not consider the comments of the former Vice President last week to be susceptible of the interpretation which my able friend has placed upon them, as he has a perfect right to do. I merely believe that he reflected the feeling of the American

people that we desire peace with justice and honor. We seek it. For that reason, we wish to continue to negotiate with the Soviet Union for a dependable and realistic test ban. That is why we hope and pray that the Atlantic Alliance may continue strong.

I generally share my colleague's views with respect to the problem of the nuclear deterrent. Quite aside from that, the American people want our country and our Government, as I say, to be united, to continue a policy of firmness toward our unyielding, unalterable American goal—to protect our own security, to eliminate communism from this hemisphere, and eventually to give to the people on this earth an opportunity themselves to determine how their own society shall conduct their own business.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2) to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities, to stimulate water research at other colleges, universities, and centers of competence, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The water resources bill, known as S. 2, is before the Senate. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time for calling the roll not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 54.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 9, after the word: "advisable", to add the following: "by the institute or center."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I think the purpose of this particular amendment is clear. It is an exceedingly simple amendment. It is a perfecting amendment. The purpose of it is to keep the control of the research in the hands of the institute or center. It is an amendment to cer-

tain language in section 100(a) of the bill, which provides for research at the land-grant colleges and institutes.

The bill now reads: "as may in each case be deemed advisable, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States and Puerto Rico."

In my opinion, that language makes the bill uncertain. I do not know what is meant by "as may in each case be deemed advisable." I do not know who determines what is advisable. So the purpose of my amendment is to be certain that the institution in the particular State where the problems are being studied is the judge of what the problems are and what is advisable, and in what case it is advisable.

I felt certain that this was merely a perfecting amendment and that the author of the bill would be willing to accept it. I am sure it would not be his idea that, for example, in the State of New Mexico the decision as to what was to be deemed advisable would be made here in Washington. I know that for the State of Colorado I would have no desire to see the Secretary of the Interior have control of money or a project where he has the say as to what is advisable. Because of the many ramifications of this subject, I think it is for the States to say which ones are advisable and which ones are not.

I may ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico as to whether he has objection to this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the able Senator from Colorado that I do have opposition. It is not the objection which the Senator probably thinks I have, but I will discuss it shortly.

Mr. ALLOTT. That being the case, and having stated my reasons for the amendment, I will reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to yield some time to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart].

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it was necessary for me to be in Michigan yesterday, and I was thus unable to join in the opening discussion of the pending bill (S. 2) and in the compliments paid its chief sponsor, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson]. But as a cosponsor of this bill, and also as one of the "minority of four" who had urged a more forceful report from the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, I am delighted and gratified that the Senator from New Mexico is forcefully pursuing the recommendations of our committee. He is not letting them die on the shelf. He is proceeding promptly, thoughtfully, and thoroughly to see that they are implemented. It is clear that he intends to see that we take all possible actions to meet the Nation's water needs of the future as envisioned by our committee.

This particular bill has been most warmly received in Michigan. Dr. John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, was given a draft of the bill last summer. He endorsed the concept, and said:

"The draft bill takes cognizance of the fact that the use of water constitutes one of the

most complex and pressing problems confronting almost every State in the country.

We in Michigan will put this program to good use. I commend the Senator for his initiative in the drafting of the legislation and for his leadership in bringing it to the floor of the Senate. I hope it will be supported overwhelmingly.

I support the Senator in his opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska wanted to speak on the bill. I thought this would be the best time for him to do so, and I yield him some time.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we are witnessing a historical change in our national thinking, as we find citizens becoming increasingly aware of the value—indeed of the preciousness—of our water resources. The bill we are considering, S. 2, provides that, in addition to the land-grant colleges and State universities, other universities and research institutions may also be aided in water resources research.

Our water resources are not by any means inexhaustible. Nor are they at present well tended. The cosponsors of S. 2 heard testimony outlining the severity of the water shortage which our country faces. Some States have already experienced the fears and frustrations arising from inadequate water reserves. I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation which should help solve some of our water resource problems.

President Kennedy's task force on water resources reported that water is being used at an alarming rate. The issue, of course, is how do we best utilize our water? How can waste be eliminated? How can reuse methods for water be found? How can the waters of the sea be desalinized at the least cost? How can water pollution be ended? How can we assure adequate water supply for the future?

As I have had occasion to say before, water conservation cannot be the goal and responsibility of the States alone. The language of S. 2 makes available to our great State universities and colleges funds with which to establish within each State a water resources research institute, center, or equivalent agency.

In my State of Alaska a water pollution research laboratory is being located at the University of Alaska at College, near Fairbanks. It will be seek to establish how the waters of the Far North can be best put to work. The environmental studies planned within our State will have far-reaching effects in this country and in other lands.

Strange as it may seem to men and women unfamiliar with Alaska and its vast regions, our usable water supply is limited. I remember when U.S. Public Health Service employees examined our water supply and found, in amazement, that many of the streams within the State were polluted with glacial flour. This type of pollution could and does impede the usability of other Alaskan streams.

I doubt if the extent of Alaska's ground water resources will be known in even the near future. Possibly the State

will depend upon its surface waters for most of its water requirements, but certainly these questions cannot be answered until the proper research has determined some of the answers.

In years ahead Alaska will have the industry it seeks today. It will have the investment capital so needed today. It will have increased population. And it will have all the problems these improvements bring.

Dr. William R. Wood, president of the University of Alaska, has examined S. 2 as have members of his faculty. They strongly support this proposed legislation. They believe, as do I, that the program envisaged will complement the work of the U.S. Public Health Service in the Arctic research program which is being developed in the 49th State.

Mr. President, many groups have testified in support of S. 2. I will not attempt to relate their findings in detail, but I do want to mention the statement of Mrs. Haskell Rosenblum, director of the League of Women Voters of the United States, who said:

Efficient utilization and protection of our water supply is so important to national well-being that we think the Federal Government has a responsibility to encourage research in this field, research the need for which has been supported by many eminent scientists and politicians.

The League of Women Voters is non-political. The league does a good job in presenting the pros and cons of important issues to its membership, and it does a responsible job. I applaud the work of the league in the important area of water conservation, and I urge the favorable enactment of this legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this amendment directly poses the question of whether the paramount authority is in the Federal Government or the local institutions or centers. It happens that Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, and the Bureau of the Budget, supported an exactly opposite position to that being proposed by the Senator from Colorado. They sought greater Federal authority.

The Hatch Act and this bill both contain sections providing that nothing within the act shall change the relationship between colleges or universities and their States. This act carries that language. The States are jealous of their prerogatives. They should not be overriden. But there must be some Federal participation in decisions.

A good many years ago, perhaps in 1945 and 1946 and 1947, the senior Senator from New Mexico worked on an agricultural research bill, which was adopted in 1947. We found at that time, by using a punchcard system, that literally millions of dollars was being spent on projects by States who had no idea that their neighboring States were spending money on similar projects.

We had the problem of dye affecting cotton, not only in the Rain Belt, but also in other places. Research laboratories were working on the problem of how dye worked on cotton grown in desert areas. My State was one of those States. They included New Mexico, Ari-

zona, and California. We were dealing with irrigation cotton, and found that this problem existed there.

These various agencies were not working together, but independently.

As a result of the passage of the Agricultural Research Act of 1947 we were able better to program the money appropriated. We did not interfere with the State programs. We called their attention to what was going on in other areas to solve this problem, and in the solution of which they could participate.

The Hatch Act has been on the books for a long time. By using the language of the Hatch Act in S. 2, we attempt to carry over to the water field the same mutually satisfactory relationship which exists in the agricultural field, which involves a sharing in the decisions as to "advisability" of projects and policies rather than a sharp granting of ultimate authority to one side or the other.

I know that some feel it is advisable to grant this final authority to the States. I believe it would be preferable to have the States and Nation work together, as they have done under the Hatch Act. Furthermore, I do not know of any objection being made to our proposal by any land-grant colleges.

We have not stopped any land-grant college by the exercise of blind authority here in Washington.

There are many examples of how this has worked. The language in the bill is a compromise between two extremes. We have, as Dr. Edwin West Allen has said, set forth a "unique example of national administration in which influence, rather than coercion, is the policy."

That is what should exist. That is why I find myself unable to accept the amendment.

We have had a long history in this field.

This matter has been under the administration of many Secretaries of Agriculture. So far as I know, no land-grant college has ever objected to it, and no land-grant college has suggested that this proposed change should be made. We worked up this bill with the people from land-grant colleges to be sure they were satisfied. As I have said, no land-grant college has suggested that this change should be made. They are satisfied with the way the Hatch Act has worked. They are satisfied with our language in the water resources bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I had considerable difficulty in hearing the Senator from New Mexico because of the noise in the Chamber. However, I should like to say that his arguments in behalf of his position are not persuasive, to me, at least. They add up to one thing, that we are drafting a bill which is purposely vague, and we are being vague because we do not want to be tied down.

Congress has taken similar action many times, and far too many times in the past few years. Citing the Hatch Act is somewhat analogous, but not completely, because we are dealing here with completely different areas, the areas of water. I believe we have a different type of problem to deal with.

disaster. It is a great, populous city. Nonetheless, there are some rather open areas in Staten Island, the county of Richmond.

This is one time when New York needs the Nation. I am confident that the Nation will respond, as it does to disaster wherever it occurs.

I appreciate the privilege of joining with my colleague, so that we may do all we can to alleviate the impact of this misfortune.

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today my colleague, Mr. JAVITS, and I referred to a communication we had addressed to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, in which we called attention to the tragic fire on Staten Island, and requested that that county be declared a disaster area.

I am very happy to state at this time that I have just received a telephone call from the Small Business Administration in which I was informed that Staten Island has been declared a disaster area. That means that Federal loan programs will be extended to homes, businesses, churches, and charitable institutions there which have been so badly ravaged by the fire, and that the New York office of the Small Business Administration will begin promptly to handle loan applications.

I wish to express publicly to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration my appreciation for the prompt action taken to alleviate the great distress suffered by this important area of my State. I am deeply grateful.

SOVIET STRENGTH IN CUBA—ANALYZED BY HANSON W. BALDWIN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the distinguished military affairs analyst of the New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin, offers some very perceptive comments on the Soviet forces in Cuba. Mr. Baldwin reports in his column that:

There appears to be a consensus that no major reduction in Soviet strength has taken place and that the Russians are rotating troops, rather than withdrawing them.

Mr. Baldwin's views are backed by years of experience and proven accuracy. I know that his analysis will be of interest to many Senators and, therefore, ask unanimous consent that his article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOVIET STRENGTH IN CUBA PUT HIGH—SOME EXPERTS BELIEVE COUNT MAY BE 30,000 TO 40,000

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

A recent reassessment of Soviet forces in Cuba has convinced some intelligence experts that there may be 30,000 to 40,000 Russian military personnel on the island.

Many experts believe the number has not actually changed greatly since last fall; the upward revision of past figures stems from a close study of all available intelligence facts. The experts believe, too, that the Russians are rotating troops to Cuba, not withdrawing them.

These interpretations provide the background for the recent assertion by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, New York Republican,

that Russian strength in Cuba, despite withdrawals announced by the President, was still about 17,000 men.

At a news conference April 3, the President estimated that a 4,000 Soviet troops had been withdrawn in recent weeks. He did not estimate the number that remained, but left the impression that about 13,000 were still there.

CAPITAL'S OPINIONS VARY

There is no consensus in Washington about how many Soviet troops are in Cuba. In fact, some of the highest Government officials and many intelligence officers admit that they do not know how many are on the island.

It is far easier to estimate tonnages of equipment and numbers of guns than numbers of personnel. Last fall, emphasis in the intelligence community was fixed on the Soviet medium-range missiles in Cuba and there was a tendency, until after the crisis had passed, to neglect the details of the ground forces and of conventional equipment.

Moreover, it has been possible to estimate approximately the numbers of Soviet troops withdrawn from the island in recent weeks, but not how many have been brought in.

Many officials are convinced that the total number has not changed greatly and that the Russians are replacing the troops they have withdrawn in a rotation plan similar to those the United States uses for its overseas units.

SOVIET UNITS LISTED

Details are lacking on what some Pentagon officials now call the "Soviet expeditionary force" in Cuba. But some experts believe the Russians are maintaining the equivalent of a heavily reinforced motorized rifle division. Such a division normally numbers about 13,000 men.

The four principal tactical ground units, identified in the past as battalion size units, are still on the island and have made no attempt to conceal their identity.

Other units of field artillery, antiaircraft, infantry, and so on, are said to be somewhat harder to pinpoint, and a large number of the Russian forces are crews for the antiaircraft and coast defense missiles and provide communications, maintenance, and specialist services for their own and Cuban forces. An unknown number wear civilian clothes and blend into the population.

Though many intelligence experts and some Government officials say they do not know how many Russian troops are in Cuba, one said he would bet a year's pay that the number was closer to 30,000 than to 17,000, and a month's pay that it was closer to 40,000 than to 17,000.

There appears to be a consensus that no major reduction in Soviet strength has taken place and that the Russians are rotating troops, rather than withdrawing them.

The purposes of the continued presence of so large a Soviet force in Cuba could be multiple.

VARIOUS FUNCTIONS SERVED

It was undoubtedly intended originally to provide protection for the long-range missiles that Premier Khrushchev attempted to install there last fall, which have now—in the opinion of most intelligence experts—been withdrawn. Since the withdrawal of all or part of these missiles, the troops appear to have a number of functions:

To help protect the island against any invasion by the United States or by exile forces aided by the United States.

To perpetuate Premier Fidel Castro's rule and to secure the Communist government there against internal revolt.

To train Cuban forces and other Communist Latin American cadres.

To provide small infiltration and subversion units capable of exporting armed com-

munist to other areas of the Western Hemisphere.

To maintain a base of Soviet Communist military power in the Western Hemisphere for psychological and political purposes and as a bargaining gambit in the world conflict.

Some experts believe the President may not have known of the revised estimates of some intelligence experts when he implied a few weeks ago that Soviet troop strength in Cuba had been reduced to 13,000.

Some observers have been concerned that official intelligence estimates that have reached some of the highest officials during and since the Cuban crisis may have been shaped—perhaps unconsciously—to conform with policy rather than evaluating the Russian capabilities baldly.

NAVAL COURT OF INQUIRY AND THE SUBMARINE "THRESHER"

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I deplore the exaggerations and emotional distortions surrounding the naval court of inquiry into the disastrous loss of the submarine *Thresher*.

The purpose of the naval court of inquiry into the loss of the nuclear attack submarine *Thresher* is to draw from the disaster all possible knowledge of future benefit to the nuclear submarine program. Our naval shipyard workers have consistently demonstrated their mastery of the painstaking and intricate techniques required for the development of modern weapons systems.

The modern submarine reactor plant is a marvel of safety and power. Our Navy command and combat personnel have consistently shown skill and enterprise in the operation of these vessels. I am confident that the record of the court of inquiry will establish beyond doubt the overall quality of shipyard work and skill of Navy submarine personnel.

I deplore the misleading sensationalism of some reports of isolated details of testimony before the court of inquiry. It is worth pointing out that its purpose is neither recrimination nor the reckless fixing of blame. I have the utmost confidence in the court and its staff, to produce not only fair, but permanently useful findings.

No one should ignore the constructive aspects of the inquiry and its positive disclosures of meticulous inspection and competent naval management and command.

The public has a right to know about the inquiry proceedings. The doors of the hearing room should not be closed to the press, yet the importance of this inquiry imposes a responsibility upon all news media to review the whole record instead of sensational details. In that way we will meet our obligation to the men who went down with the *Thresher* in learning the truth and making of it an instrument for improving the submarine service.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am increasingly disturbed over the reception which the President's tax program has been receiving. While I am not necessarily in agreement with all the specific reform proposals contained in the original message, I am convinced of the im-

ALBERT prefers the gentle touch with party members if it can be used profitably.
"My view is that you get further with people if you work in a cooperative manner and get them to go along willingly rather than by putting on the heat."

[From the Tulsa Tribune, Mar. 22, 1963]
CONGRESS' SENIORITY PLAN A BRAKE
(By Jenk Jones, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—It may seem odd that the man charged with the responsibility of getting new legislation through Congress should revere the system which often makes his job more difficult.

But House Majority Leader CARL ALBERT of McAlester lauds the seniority system which gives the heads of committees extraordinary power in Congress.

For despite the fact his job is to effect many changes, ALBERT favors the evolution rather than the revolution of our laws.

"It was never intended that our Government should change drastically" after each election, he said.

There has long been criticism, especially from liberal circles, that present system thwarts attempts to pass legislation for new programs.

ALBERT, however, sees the committee system, based as it is on seniority, as an effective brake against runaway legislation.

He said the committee chairmen, who are generally Southerners or members of big city machine politics, usually have a traditional view of matters.

On the other hand, the "demands of the last election" are expressed in the choice of the President and the congressional leadership and in the new Member of Congress.

The merging of these opposites frequently results in progress without reckless speed, ALBERT contends.

"The response (of Congress) should be to the deliberative will of the people and not to snap judgments."

Even when the President advocates a major change, the interactions of Congress work in an atmosphere that slows down the proposal and "demands major justification" for its acceptance, ALBERT added.

He listed two major benefits derived from the existing system:

1. "It brings stability to the House, and makes the direction it takes more important than the speed.

2. "Men become experienced in legislative areas. The system enables legislators to become professionals in their fields."

ALBERT acknowledged there has been a strong trend in recent years toward a larger Federal Government and a more powerful executive department.

The former is inevitable, he said, because of "the shift from an agrarian to an industrial population."

There is now more interdependence of people on one another, ALBERT added. This has necessitated the Government playing an increasingly important role in citizens' lives.

WEST VIRGINIANS PARTICIPATE IN 33D NATIONAL 4-H CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.—NEARLY 2,286,000 YOUTH BELONG TO 94,707 CLUBS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. President, the worthwhile activities of 4-H Clubs are part of the national educational system of cooperative extension work in agriculture and homemaking in which the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the State land-grant colleges, and counties participate.

More than 2,285,592 young Americans, chiefly in rural areas, between the ages of 10 and 21 years, belong to the more than 94,707 local 4-H Clubs located in every agricultural county in the United States and Puerto Rico. Additionally, there are approximately 307,745 adult leaders and 114,959 junior leaders lending guidance to these useful activities. And, the 4-H Club idea is now world-wide, the plan having been adapted to fit widely varying conditions in some 70 different countries.

The 33d National 4-H Conference is being held here in the Nation's Capital from April 20 to 26, and attended by delegates from each of the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and Canada.

During a week of inspiration, learning, and fellowship the young people will have an opportunity to attain an insight into the individual and group responsibilities of the American citizen. They will achieve a deeper and keener appreciation of our rich heritage. They will meet national leaders who are responsible for determining major policy, and discuss with them areas of particular interest. Throughout, the delegates will be encouraged to express their own ideas and to ask questions, thereby bringing to the conference the benefit of their own background of experience in 4-H work and community service.

This morning it was my privilege to attend the breakfast with Congress' portion of the conference, attended by many Senators and Representatives. We enjoyed a meal in a congenial and informal atmosphere designed to provide the young citizens an opportunity to meet the legislators from their own State.

On this occasion, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON expressed greetings, and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, brought a helpful message.

Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS and Hon. KEN HECHLER were at our table with the 4-H Club delegates from West Virginia, as well as adult leaders from the Mountain State who are attending the conference. Present were delegates Jorene Butcher, Glenville, W. Va.; Rose Lee Matthews, Monongah, W. Va.; Richard Steven Hannah, Mount Clare, W. Va.; and Edwin Hill, Chesapeake, W. Va. During the conference Miss Butcher serves as a member of the speakers committee, Miss Matthews is on the hospitality committee, Mr. Hannah on the recreation committee, and Mr. Hill is a representative on the vesper committee.

Also representing West Virginia were Miss Mildred Fizer, State extension 4-H programs leader, and C. P. Dorsey, State extension 4-H Club leader. These devoted citizens commented on the success of the 4-H movement in West Virginia, pointing out that there is representation in each of our 55 counties, and that membership now exceeds 35,000 and is growing rapidly. They also paid deserved tribute to the efforts of the late T. P. Kendrick, the first State extension 4-H leader for West Virginia. I, too, was privileged to know and work with this good and great 4-H organizer.

Two other responsible and civic-minded Americans were with the West Virginians during the breakfast program: Miss Gertrude Warren, an energetic pioneer at the national level in 4-H work; and Miss Bonnie Rollins, representing the Farm Journal magazine. It was valuable to our youth to share the thinking of these two ladies, and to discuss with them the impacts of 4-H programs.

Mr. President, the 4-H Clubs are making a significant contribution to the mental, physical, and moral growth of young people the world over. The members of this purposeful organization, and their dedicated adult leaders, are deserving of our highest praise for their devotion to principle and patriotism.

FIRE IN STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING, Mr. President, a tragic fire, swept by high winds, has devastated hundreds of homes in Staten Island, N.Y. Almost 300,000 acres of land have been blackened in a fire which involved more than half of New York City's fire department who fought this fire with great courage and diligence.

Staten Island is a community of homeowners and small businesses populated by hard working, prudent citizens. Our sympathy is extended to them over the severe and heart-rending losses they have suffered.

In an effort to be of assistance to these people, I have communicated with John Horne, the administrator of the Small Business Administration, asking that this county be declared a disaster area for purposes of receiving emergency Federal aid. I have also contacted Borough President Maniscalco, expressing my extreme concern for the people of this community and offering to do everything possible to help them through this crisis.

I take this opportunity to express my support for the efforts of the people of Staten Island to rebuild their homes and businesses after this tragedy, and I assure them that the Federal Government—as is true, I am sure, of all their Representatives in Congress—is working to obtain help for them.

Mr. JAVITS, Mr. President, I join with my colleague from New York in the sympathy extended to the people of Staten Island, whose homes have been devastated by fire. This also is true of the people in the parts of New Jersey similarly affected.

I join also in paying tribute to the heroism and high sense of duty of the New York City fire department. As a member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I join with my colleague in the request that this be declared a disaster area.

I assure the people of Staten Island of the indefatigable efforts I know we shall make—and which I know the whole New York delegation will make—to see to it that the resources of the Federal Government give to them such aid in this disaster as is practicable and possible.

It is not often, Mr. President, that we think of New York City in terms of a

The liberal can't believe that removing the penalties for misbehavior or lack of performance could increase human cussedness and sloth. Instead, according to his theory, what we need are more social workers, more public housing, more youth clubs. And with them we keep getting more chiselers, more illegitimate children, more delinquency and crime.

One problem with the liberal is that he's getting way behind the times. He can't adjust his dogmas to new forces. He looks at labor-management problems as though the Pinkertons were still shooting the strikers at Homestead. The significance of Jimmy Hoffa eludes him. He is furious at the price-raising attempt by United States Steel, but unable to comprehend the cost-fixing capabilities of the United Steel Workers. He is still chasing Commodore Vanderbilt and the beef trust.

The liberal thus deludes himself with the comfortable assurance that he is far-seeing, a progressive, a man of the future. In his effort to cure injustice by piling on more government he forgets that all the great struggles for freedom have been directed against the overblown force of government.

He has, with minor interruptions, been in power in America for 30 years. He is getting gray, and even a little quaint. He won't admit error or consider pragmatic results. He has concocted his medicine, and as our colic increases he merely calls for bigger doses.

The liberal is a nice guy. He is loving us to death.

CUBA FAILURE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, many of us have been reporting, from all over the country, to our colleagues and to members of the administration, the complete confusion on the part of the American public as to what we are doing or what we are not doing in terms of trying to regain for the Cuban people, themselves, the control of their own government.

I have been among those who have felt that the policy of indecision has been so extreme that we have been left in a position of failure insofar as concerns the protection of other countries in Central and South America. The prestige of the United States has gone down sharply. We must develop a policy which will afford some assurance of success over the next few years. Such policy should include a process of giving to the Cubans themselves the right to control their own government.

In the New York Post for April 11, a columnist, Mr. William V. Shannon, who is rather noted for his support of the present administration, wrote an analysis of the Cuban situation under the title of "Cuban Failure." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA FAILURE

(By William V. Shannon)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration's rupture with Jose Miro Cardona, coming on the second anniversary of the mismanaged Bay of Pigs invasion, brings to a close a cycle of defeat, political ignorance, and moral confusion in America's relations with the Cuban revolution. Everything has now been surrendered, including honor, and we have no policy nor recourse save to wait for whatever good or bad tidings the future

may bring. Events have passed out of our hands.

It is instructive to recall the state of affairs when Mr. Kennedy took office. Castro, having been in power for 2 years, had already aligned himself with the Communists, broken with the liberal elements in the revolutionary coalition, and was far advanced in transforming an indigenous radical uprising into a self-shackled Communist dependency.

A brave and active underground movement against the dictator was spreading. Exiles in Florida were alive with hope for his early overthrow. The United States which had encouraged Batista to depart and which had originally extended a sympathetic tolerance to the Castro government, was in a strong position to influence the course of events, both in its own national interest and in the interest of the freedom of the Cuban people. There were then no Soviet troops and no short-range Soviet missiles in Cuba.

The Kennedy administration took office seemingly committed to a clear and sound policy that this country would not permit a Communist Cuba. Since the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, the United States had taken the consistent position that we would not allow foreign countries to establish new colonies or export alien systems of government to this hemisphere. Since Castro had turned out to be only a stalking horse for the Communists, we had no alternatives except to force his departure or compromise our historic position.

There were only two ways to get rid of Castro. One was to organize a mixed invasion of Cubans and Americans under the aegis of a government-in-exile which we would recognize. The other was to organize sabotage, political subversion and economic pressure. This program could only have succeeded if the administration had been willing to make bold political decisions. In a revolutionary situation, the most effective alternative is usually a group only a shade less radical than the faction one is trying to overthrow. What was wanted was a political leadership for the Cuban underground-and-exile movement that shared most of Castro's original radical social and economic program but disavowed his terrorism and his links to Moscow. We shall never know if a left-of-center alternative, properly supported by the United States, could have brought Castro down. The President and his brother, Robert and their CIA and State Department advisers lacked the political sophistication and imagination to attempt it.

President Kennedy chose the more direct alternative of an invasion. Since the Cuban exiles ranged from radicals to reactionaries, a temporary coalition was pasted together under the presidency of Miro Cardona, an honorable man of centrist sympathies. But this coalition was not recognized as a government in exile. The administration also held back from providing the U.S. troops and planes necessary to bolster the exile force. Moreover, the CIA, with extraordinary political obtuseness, placed most of its reliance on the sons of the wealthy and on the supporters of the fallen Batista. In short, the White House policymakers avoided the political choices and the CIA made the wrong ones.

There was nothing wrong, in my judgment, with a mixed Cuban-and-American military intervention to throw out Castro except that once embarked upon, it could not be allowed to fail. President Kennedy did allow it to fail.

But there was no reason, after that single defeat, for panic or despair. The political alternative could still be attempted, although now under less favorable circumstances, or a second successful invasion could be properly planned and carried out. Instead, the administration did nothing. The 18 wasted months from April 1961 to October 1962, are

in my opinion, a worse offense on the administration's record than the defeat of the Bay of Pigs invasion. What had appeared to be a firm resolve to get rid of Castro proved, after only one setback, to be made of jelly.

The only conclusion drawn from the events of April 1961, was that clandestine operations are impossible in a democracy. The exiles and the underground were simply written off as too divided and unmanageable. Micawberism—"Maybe something will turn up"—reigned.

What turned up were the Russian missiles. Khrushchev had not wasted those 18 months. Mr. Kennedy was able to force the Russians to withdraw the missiles by going to the edge of nuclear war. We are all grateful to him that his resolute firmness in October succeeded, but he is scarcely entitled to any credit for handling Cuban affairs in such a way that they produced a nuclear crisis. The introduction of the Soviet missiles completely exposed the shallowness of those, in the administration and in the general public, who thought we could happily co-exist with a Communist Cuba. Because we permitted Castro to stay in power, Khrushchev very nearly outflanked us on our defenseless southern border.

The long-range missiles are presumably gone, but Cuba is far stronger militarily than it was 2 years ago. We cannot get rid of Castro because his safety has now become linked with Khrushchev's prestige. Cuba has become like Berlin, a hostage in the cold war. The suppression of the Cuban raiders and the dropping of poor Miro Cardona constitute the final admission that we have met total defeat on the Cuban front. The Cuban people have been left to the mercies of their bearded tyrant.

DEATH OF DR. A. WHITNEY GRISWOLD, PRESIDENT OF YALE UNIVERSITY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Dr. A. Whitney Griswold, president of Yale University, died on Friday, April 19, at New Haven, Conn. I knew him, served under him as a member of the Yale Council, respected him and held him in deep affection. But there are thousands of Yale students and graduates, members of the faculty, associates in the profession of teaching, and people in every walk of life who came in association with him, who were moved by his teachings and writings, and who felt his influence. His influence in thought and action moved far beyond the confines of Yale University, and had its bearing upon our Nation.

He has been described as an eloquent defender of academic freedom—and that description is correct. He was a strong believer in the fundamental soundness of our system of government and our political philosophy, and therefore he was not fearful of academic freedom, and freedom of inquiry throughout our Nation. He defended freedom, and advocated it, courageously and joyfully.

There is so much that he said to choose from, but I would like to quote the following:

The only loyalty upon which true reliance can be placed is the kind evoked by the inherent virtue of the cause or institution or individual toward which the loyalty is felt. In creating this kind of loyalty, oaths are of little value compared to the devotion of a man who has been free to examine and evaluate the evidence and, on the strength of that experience, in Cromwell's words, "knows what he fights for and loves what he knows."

to our advantage to have a government, whatever its form, that is hostile to the Communist bloc and friendly to the West.

We have helped to knock out Diefenbaker, weaken Macmillan, jar De Gaulle, and to be indifferent to Adenauer. Ultra leftwingers of our country want Franco of Spain and Salazar of Portugal eliminated, even though they are friendly to the cause of the West. We helped in the eradication of Batista and the establishment of Castro. As between Batista, who was friendly to the West, and Castro, who is hostile to it, it would have been far better for the Western Hemisphere and the people of the world to have continued Batista in power.

Finally, if we are to continue destroying our friends, our problems will grow more dangerous as time goes on. This we cannot endure. Manifestly, if we are to serve the best interest of our country, we must quit insulting and quit weakening the nations which wish to be friendly to our cause.

THE ADVOCATES OF FISCAL INTEGRITY

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently many of us who have been discussing the need for fiscal integrity in this country and for reducing the unnecessary spending at the present level have been accused of having old-fashioned Puritan ethics and outmoded concepts of government. We have been told that the only way to move the country forward is to spend more of the people's money that we do not have and will not have for many, many years to come.

Recently, Mr. President, I came on a very thoughtful and entertaining article, published in the Wall Street Journal, which comments on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 13, 1963]

How To Pick A Pocket Or Two

To a smalltown fellow come to the big city it was bound to happen sooner or later, and finally it did. On the way to Wall Street, that den of iniquity, our pocket was picked in the subway, that haunt of the huddled masses.

Along with a couple of credit cards, an unfilled prescription for the drug store, and a shopping list from the lady of the house, this skillful disciple of Fagin made off with \$100, which for years we've kept secreted in the back of our wallet against such grave emergencies as running out of expense-account money in San Antonio or St. Paul.

Now being imbued with a Puritan ethic, we do not approve of pickpockets, especially those who pick our own. But in all honesty we must confess that purely from the standpoint of the Nation's economic balance sheet there was no net loss to the country. Indeed, if some of the economic theories bruited about today are correct, it could be argued that the Nation's economy had been helped thereby.

For our loss of \$100 was somebody else's gain of \$100, the one canceling out the other insofar as economic statistics are concerned. Furthermore, since there was a transfer of funds from one party to another there was a

gain in the gross national product as well as the national income. The fact that we paid an exorbitant price for the service received; namely, a lesson in personal finance management—is no concern in abstract economics.

Finally, we suspect the unknown artist of the subway is less well endowed with worldly goods than we are, less likely to keep the money out of circulation as idle savings for a rainy day. So this transfer of our funds to his pocket probably resulted in an increase in the Nation's consumer spending.

Whatever our personal feelings, then, the result represents a consummation devoutly to be wished by the influential thinkers of the day. The whole object of current economic policy is to increase the transfer of funds, raising the statistics of national income and the gross national product, and especially such transfers of funds as may increase consumer spending. The sociological objective is called the "redistribution of income."

Hence the great emphasis on Government spending, which has gotten to be a large part of the gross national product. There's no surer and more efficient way to transfer huge sums than to take taxes from citizens of, say, New York and spend them in New Mexico or Mississippi. According to this thinking, it's a further help if the dollars can be transferred from corporations and rich folk, who might have a proclivity toward savings, to the hands of those who will inject it more quickly into the spending stream.

We are told that the good effects of all this are enhanced if the Government, unlike our friend on the subway, can spend more than it takes or at least seem to. Big deficits, especially those arising from tax cuts, allow more dollars to be put in some people's pockets without appearing to take quite so much out of other people's pockets.

True, this is illusory; what the Government spends it must take away from somebody in some form. Nonetheless, there's no denying it's less painful to steal a bit from everybody's dollars by inflation than to take the money away from them in immediate taxes.

On the subway we had a blissful ignorance of being plucked until, much later in the day, we found ourselves less well off than we thought. And even now we think there must be many a helpful pickpocket who wishes that policemen understood the ethics of the new economics.

LIBERAL FORMULA FOR HAPPINESS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, over a period of years we have been told by many persons that the liberals have the only true concept of government and are the only ones who understand what government is all about, and that somehow or other all conservatives are but a few centuries ahead of Louis XIV, and that is about all.

I hold in my hand an entertaining article, published on April 22 in the Washington Star, which goes quite clearly into the concept of liberals in government and what they are trying to avow, insofar as the concept of government is concerned. It seems to me the article is both timely and extremely pertinent to many of the debates in the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LIBERAL FORMULA FOR HAPPINESS—SOME ACCUSED OF CHAMPIONING LIBERTY WHILE FAVORING CREEPING COERCION

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

Self-styled liberals are generally nicer people than sour-puss reactionaries.

It would be better to be cast away on a desert island with an outgoing and outgoing liberal than with a guy who's against everything including the construction of a raft. But this doesn't mean that liberal government is a good recipe for equity or human happiness. Many liberals suffer from smug assumptions about human behavior and political theory that simply don't jibe with reality.

They are capable of a great degree of dogma, while imagining themselves to be the foes of dogma. They honestly believe themselves to be champions of liberty while they favor creeping coercion as long as they can be the authors of the coercion. They are so sure their theories are good for you that they think they are only doing you a favor when they tie you to a post, pry open our jaws, and pour their nostrums down your throat.

Willie Howard, the late great Jewish comedian, had a skit in which he impersonated a Communist holding forth in Union Square. "Comes da revolution," shouted Willie, "you'll eat strawberries and cream."

"But," protested someone in his stage audience, "I don't like strawberries and cream."

Willie assumed a contemptuous sneer, "Comes da revolution and you'll eat strawberries and cream."

This is not a bad description of the liberal formula for human happiness.

One of the chief characteristics of the professional liberal in America is his naive belief in the corrective power of law. Every time he sees social maladjustment or a personal tragedy he wants to pass a law to correct it. Gradually and with the best intentions he weaves a net of verbotens and must-dos that paralyzes the individual.

If you keep on passing laws to obviate every possible injustice, eventually you arrive at the ultimate injustice, the police state.

Although the liberal often professes a contempt for money, he has almost a childlike faith in its power. What he can't cure with a law he thinks he can cure with an appropriation. When mulish taxpayers balk at such expenditures at the local level, he demands that the Federal Government take over, on the sound theory that the farther the taxing agency is removed from the individual the more chance there is that the individual will be complacent about the tax. The argument: "If Oklahoma doesn't take the money, Maine will" is a potent one.

Therefore, the liberal arrives quite logically at his advocacy of centralized power. Centralized power is the device by which the normal caution of the taxpayer is overwhelmed by his greed. Federal aid to schools will provide more teachers without raising school district taxes. Ninety percent Federal highway money means that he won't have to pay for a bond issue. Increased Federal relief means that local responsibility can be shirked. And so supergovernment grows and the liberal is delighted.

He is delighted because he questions whether local government will ever have adequate social vision. But he will see to it that the supergovernment has. There will be plans, bold plans of new frontiers entered into with vigor.

The liberal also seems to hold a double standard in the matter of human behavior. He is irate about the greed of corporations and the evils of stock options. But the mugger in the park who stabs for \$20 is a deprived person who wouldn't have gone wrong if there had been enough social legislation.

April 23

wise to discontinue its operations in Rochester, and so did Meyer. He and Lena loved Washington and they returned to it where he began the last phase of his active life. Working first with Brookings and later with the Library of Congress he put to use his vast knowledge, his extraordinary experience, his intellectual facility, his capacity for improvisation, and became of great value to students, to researchers, and to Members of Congress. This proved to be a happy period in Meyer's and Lena's life. Their children were grown up and married and on their own. The Jacobsteins loved Washington. They had many interests and many fine friends, but this too had to come to an end and Meyer returned to Rochester.

Those who knew Meyer only in this latter period of his life when he was back home and didn't know quite what to do with himself, hardly knew the Meyer whom most of us here knew and loved. Although he did direct an employment survey for Governor Harriman, something seemed to have gone out of him when he left Washington for good. I urged him to write his life experience which was really extraordinary but apparently this wasn't his talent or his interest. He could speak with remarkable charm, facility, delight, and humor about his experiences on every level from the common man up to Presidents of the United States. But somehow he couldn't get around to write about it.

We turn now from Meyer's external achievements which tell us what he did but not what he was, to the personality of the man. We draw the curtain over these last few years of decline and disability to the man we knew for threescore years and ten and more, for the personality that was warm and vital, colorful, charming. We think of the man who found everything interesting and was interested in everybody and who thereby became himself a very interesting personality. We see his eyes light up as a new idea strikes fire. His mind was facile. It leaped from one thing to another quickly and brilliantly. He had the capacity to think through and around a question, seeing its various sides. We remember Meyer's humor, his ready laughter, his charm. There was indeed something warm and light-giving in his personality. His very name—Meyer—which could be translated as light-giver—somehow expressed the light, the warmth, that Meyer brought into the life of others. He looked for the good in others. As Shelley said in another connection, "Life like a dome of many-colored glass stains the white radiance of eternity."

I see in Meyer not only his achievements but the capacity to achieve. He symbolized the best of the children of Jewish immigrants to this land; out of humble origins doing so much with their own lives and doing so much for America. He loved this country. It was an inspiration to him. He felt that he was only paying back, when he served it, a fraction of what it had done for him and for his family. Perhaps because of the influence of the Boys' Evening Home and Dr. Gannett and his associates at the Unitarian Church his Jewishness was broad. He was a profoundly loyal and devoted Jew but he also had strong universal feelings. He would like to go to religious services other than Jewish. He read the writings of religious thinkers whose views were very different from those of the official representatives of the synagogue. He and Lena were particularly fond of the writings of Robert and Elizabeth Barrett Browning. In some way Robert Browning's poem "Rabbi Ben Ezra" captures much of Meyer's spirit and outlook.

"Grow old along with me!

The best is yet to be,

The last of life, for which the first was made;

Our times are in His hand

Who saith, 'A whole I planned,

Youth shows but half; trust God; see all, nor be afraid.'

So, take and use Thy work;

Amend what flaws may lurk,

What strain o' the stuff, what warpings paid the aim!

My times be in Thy hand!

Perfect the cup as planned!

Let age approve of youth, and death complete the same."

How can I begin to do justice to what Meyer meant to his family. He was a source of pride to them. He was helpful to them in every way that was needed. He was a loyal and devoted brother. His nephews and nieces loved him.

The marriage of Meyer and Lena was so good, so wonderful, so mutually satisfying that one almost hesitates to speak of it. They were such a perfect combination. Lena with her keen, Lipsky mind, level headed, wise and practical. Meyer, colorful, volatile, constantly challenged and stimulated with new ideas. And both blessed with a sense of humor which enabled them to laugh at each other, but more often with each other.

How he loved his children, and how they loved him. And how he loved his grandchildren, and how they loved him. This was not the feeling toward a father or grandfather based on a sense of duty, but he was so much fun to be with that they just loved being with him.

As we think of Meyer in decline, as we saw how the frail body could not begin to keep up with the spirit, we can't wish him back. But we can remember him with affection and with profound gratitude. He gave us something as individuals and as a community which was unique and for which we will be eternally thankful. Remembering his feeling of responsibility we, who knew him and cared for him, should carry on where he left off. Because of you.

We lift our hearts in prayer to the God, God of Israel, God of all mankind, the God of the universe, in whom Meyer deeply believed. O God our Father and Friend, we thank Thee for this good man. We thank Thee for the richness and the warmth of his personality, for his usefulness and his helpfulness to his fellowmen, for the inspiration that he gave to youth, for the heritage of good works that he has left behind him as an enduring monument. We thank Thee for the love that he gave and for the love that he received. We thank Thee for the nearly threescore years of good companionship with his beloved wife. We thank Thee for his children and theirs who gladdened his life. Help us to the faith that death is not the end. That such goodness, usefulness, love, do not die but live on in other lives better because of them, live on somehow eternally with Thee. Help us with the faith to carry on in his spirit and to continue good works to which he devoted his life. Strengthen us now with the faith of his fathers which sustained him throughout his life and which should strengthen and comfort us now as we contemplate his death.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, my friend, Meyer Jacobstein, is dead. That my personal loss is great is understandable, for our friendship endured many, many years, both in and out of Congress. I sought freely and he gave freely to me,

of his counsel, of his affection, of his wisdom.

There are those who knew him only and measured him only by the standards of his attainments—as Congressman, as editor and journalist, as educator, as banker, and as economist. He had been elected to the 68th, 69th, and 70th Congresses from March 4, 1923, through March 3, 1929, but did not seek renomination.

Formidable as these achievements may be, they are as nothing when compared to Meyer Jacobstein's depth of heart. Meyer Jacobstein is known as a newsboy Congressman. As a mere lad, who sold newspapers on the corners of the street, he never lost the common touch. He had experienced hardship first-hand and had retained the memory of those days so that to him the qualities of kindness and of mercy bespoke the noblest ideals of man. And these qualities were reflected in everything he said and did—in his political life, in his affiliation with the Government, in his friendships, and as husband and father.

After a day of tension, it was good to be with Meyer. He put things into perspective. His smile was gentle, his voice was gentle, and his soul was gentle. I am poorer and the world is poorer for his passing. I talk of my own sorrow so much because Meyer Jacobstein was a part of my life, a very precious part.

When he left Washington, after his retirement as economic counsel in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, I thought then that life had become a little grayer because Meyer was not there to break bread with and to talk with, but we wrote to each other and that was a measure of consolation. Now that he is gone from us, that vacuum is complete.

It is not fashionable these days, I know, to speak of one as "a good man," but I say that Meyer Jacobstein was a good man, possessed of that rare combination of mind and heart. The world has need of men like Meyer. It is my hope that there will be many who will study the story of this man's life and follow the ideals he set for himself and fulfilled. His wife, Lena, his family, and his colleagues, know that story. I hope one day it will be written.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the passing of Dr. Meyer Jacobstein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ACTION NOW ON CUBA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:
Proverbs 29: 18: *Where there is no vision, the people cast off restraint.*

Most merciful and gracious God, may our President, our Speaker, and all who hold positions of leadership and trust lay hold of their many difficult tasks with confidence.

May they continue to possess that soul of adventure and that strength of vision and faith which are often darkened by doubt but never eclipsed; delayed and disappointed by adversity, but never defeated.

Grant that the whole world may come to see that our Nation is rooted in spiritual realities and ruled by a passionate devotion to the ideals of liberty and justice, friendship and fraternity.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HOUSE BILL ENROLLED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, announced that that committee had on April 22, 1963, examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, April 22, 1963, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

THE LATE DR. MEYER JACOBSTEIN

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a memorial service, conducted by Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein of Temple B'rith Kodesh.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad duty that causes me to rise on this occasion, for I must report to my colleagues the death of a former Member of Congress.

Last Thursday—April 18—in my home community of Rochester, N.Y., death took Dr. Meyer Jacobstein. Dr. Jacobstein was 83 years old.

Dr. Jacobstein was the elected Representative of the 38th Congressional District—now the 36th Congressional Dis-

trict—of New York State for three terms. He served successively in the 68th, 69th, and 70th Congresses.

Today, only five men are in the House who served alongside Dr. Jacobstein.

As a Congressman, teacher, labor mediator, banker, publisher, and scholar, he impressed his vital personality on the scene of Rochester, N.Y., for more than half a century. His life was always one of service and concern for the public good and much of his effort was a community contribution.

During his 6 years of service in the House of Representatives from 1923 to 1929, Dr. Jacobstein became widely known and respected for the knowledge and understanding he brought to the many matters which were before the Congress. He represented his constituents with dedication and ability.

Dr. Jacobstein was a constant inspiration to those who knew him and came under the influence of his intellect.

Our condolences on this personal loss go to his widow and two daughters, Mrs. Harold Berlove, of Webster, N.Y., and Mrs. Joseph Thaler, of Spokane, Wash.

This past Sunday evening in Rochester, N.Y., a memorial service was held for Dr. Jacobstein. His longtime friend and spiritual leader, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, of Temple B'rith Kodesh, delivered a moving eulogy.

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR DR. MEYER JACOBSTEIN

Meyer Jacobstein was one of the stars, one of the luminaries, that swam into my horizon when I was a youth in Rochester. I thought of him then as a warm, colorful, extraordinary personality, and I have never had any reason to change that opinion. He was even at that time a poor Jewish boy who had made good. He was a professor of economics at the University of Rochester where Jews in those days were not very numerous. He lectured brilliantly in the community and was highly popular.

Then when I returned to Rochester as rabbi of this temple in 1928, a relationship developed which continued through the years and which meant much to me in my own life. On my part it was a feeling of affection, friendship, of respect, and I think he returned this feeling. Out of that relationship I speak of him today.

First let me talk about his accomplishments, the externals of his life. Here was the son of a poor immigrant family, one of nine children. He had to earn his way peddling newspapers. And out of this difficult background came his remarkable achievements. He was one of the boys in whom Dr. Gannett of the Unitarian Church took an interest, and which led to the founding of the Boys' Evening Home which meant so much in the lives of men like Meyer, and Ben Goldstein, Sol Appelbaum, and others. This broadened his horizon and led him on to new fields.

He became a brilliant economist and, after having taught for awhile in the Midwest, returned to Rochester where his students liked him very much for they found him progres-

sive, intelligent, stimulating. He was interested in labor relationships and this was a comparatively early period in those relationships in the clothing industry. In due course he found himself a labor mediator and arbitrator, and handling labor relationships for clothing firms. He never ceased to be an economist. In fact he became a better economist as through involvement in public life as Congressman, banker, publisher, and the head of a business institute, he learned more intimately, more realistically, what makes the wheels go round. My brother Irving, among many others, is greatly indebted to Meyer for direction, counsel, stimulation, and information, which he received when Meyer was a member of the faculty of that great Brookings Institution in Washington. Subsequently Meyer became of invaluable help to his former colleagues when he served on the staff of the Library of Congress and gave help, guidance, information, counsel, to the Members of Congress as they sought to think through the economic problems that confronted our National Legislature.

Because personally Meyer was eager and ambitious and also civic minded with a strong sense of public responsibility, he decided to run for Congress. Everything was against him. He was a Democrat, and in Rochester Democrats then were very much in the minority. He was a Jew. He was a liberal and in those days a liberal might be regarded as a radical. A powerful political machine was lined up against him. Nevertheless, in spite of all these handicaps, by the sheer power of his personality, his good sense, his obvious usefulness, his hard work, he was elected to the Congress of the United States. There he remained for 6 years, and could have stayed on indefinitely if he had chosen. He was one of the best Congressmen this area has ever had with a very strong sense of responsibility not only to his own constituency but also to the country, and to its welfare. In those days I would talk with other Members of Congress who told me how highly regarded he was by his colleagues, which was understandable, because he knew more than most of them about the problems that were confronting the Nation. In that period it became clear that Meyer was loved by the common man, and respected by the uncommon one. The poor, the immigrant, the Negro found in him an understanding friend. The cultivated person saw something of extraordinary worth in Meyer's warm, multifaceted personality.

After a time he found the wear and tear of congressional responsibilities too much for him and his family. He also was concerned with building up his economic position for the future. So he returned to Rochester and before long this man who had been a left-of-center liberal, an economics professor, a labor authority, a Democratic Member of Congress, became the president of a bank. During the depression, Meyer's bank was absorbed by a larger one (we had no bank failures in Rochester) and not long thereafter he became the publisher of the Journal American. My impression was that he thoroughly enjoyed this activity. It enabled him to express himself, to be in the thick of community and national life. It was challenging and stimulating to him, but then in due course the newspaper found it

1963

6441

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the release of 21 Americans from Castro's jails now provides the United States with a clear path for new action to free Cuba. No longer must U.S. policies be based on fear of jeopardizing the safety of Castro's American hostages.

And no longer can the U.S. Government underestimate the growing consensus in America that coexistence with a Cuba dominated by a hostile foreign power will not be tolerated.

The Communist world even now attempts to shift America's attention from Cuba by fomenting anxiety in southeast Asia. For America to fall prey to this tactic would only give Khrushchev another cold war hot spot to turn off and on at will.

As one who has long recommended that this Nation lead the OAS into firm sanctions against Cuba, it is gratifying to me to see support for this approach echoing from responsible places in our Government. Is it gratifying and my hope that the release of these American prisoners will now signal an intensified, hard-driving, and comprehensive U.S. program to topple Communist Cuba.

THE DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT OF ISRAEL

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House this morning of a sad event, the death of the President of Israel, Itzhak Ben-Zvi. The President of Israel made, in my opinion, significant contributions to the forging of abiding ties of friendship between Israel and many new and older nations of the free world. He had many friends in this country. He believed strongly in close ties between the United States and Israel. His loss will be much felt in this country and throughout the free world.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the distinguished gentlemen from New York has taken this time for this purpose. I had the honor of visiting the State of Israel while the gentleman was serving as ambassador with great distinction and devotion. No one is better able than he to speak the life and service of president Itzhak Ben-Zvi. I know we all join with him in an expression of sorrow over the loss of one of the great men of the world. I know I speak for Members on this side as well as the other side of the aisle when I say this. I extend my personal condolences to the family of the late president and to the people of Israel.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I should like merely to add that I believe it to be the sense of the Congress that all of us here would like to express our condolences to the people of Israel, to Mrs. Ben-

Zvi and to the family on the passing of this statesman and scholar who contributed much to the future of the world.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Ashley	Henderson	Shelley
Betta	King, Calif.	Sheppard
Brock	Lennon	Skubitz
Buckley	Lesinski	Steed
Chenoweth	Lloyd	Talcott
Dent	Martin, Mass.	Tollefson
Fisher	Pepper	Vinson
Forrester	Pillion	Walter
Frelinghuysen	Powell	Whitten
Gubser	Purcell	Widnall
Hardy	Rivers, S.C.	Williams
Healey	Roosevelt	Wylder
Hébert	Schadeberg	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 392 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 305, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12) to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of that hour to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], and pending that, Mr. Speaker, all I will say is that the reading of the resolution makes clear that this is an open rule providing for 3 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. (Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], a member of the Rules Committee, has explained, this resolution makes in order, under 3 hours of general debate and an open rule, to be followed by the 5-minute rule for consideration of amendments, H.R. 12.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is designed to increase the opportunities for the training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes, which comes to us from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which, as the Members know, has legislative jurisdiction over all legislative problems and matters dealing with the Public Health Service.

The bill, as I read it and understand it, really consists of two main sections or divisions. One would provide Federal grants to different types of schools in the Public Health Service field for brick and mortar construction either of new buildings or for the reconstruction or expansion and modernization of existing buildings.

This particular provision of the bill would be designed for the purpose of furnishing training based on this consideration, the population and the availability of trained technicians or physicians, pharmacists, optometrists, podiatrists, nurses, dentists, or professional public health personnel in various sections of the country. It provides some \$175 million in Federal funds to be granted over a 3-year period for construction purposes. Some of the funds could be furnished on a matching basis of as much as 75 percent to be paid by the Federal Government and 25 percent by the schools or other agencies. In some instances the Federal Government would give 66 2/3 percent of the cost of this brick and mortar construction work, and in other instances the contribution of the Federal Government by way of grants for construction of these schools and other facilities would be 50 percent, for a total cost, as I said, for the 3-year period, according to the report, of about \$175 million.

The other portions of the bill are devoted to establishing, creating or setting up a loan program to furnish loans and financial aid to students who might attend these schools to study medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and the other related professions in the Public Health Service field; and those loans would cost on the first 3-year basis, according to the report on page 5, something like \$30,700,000 or \$30,800,000. In addition to that there would be administrative expense over the 3-year period, 1964, 1965, and 1966, of some \$1,150,000.

So there are really two questions before the House in connection with this legislation. One is whether or not the House of Representatives and the Congress itself feels that the Government should furnish financial aid for brick

and mortar work in the construction of buildings and facilities for medical, dental and pharmaceutical schools as outlined in this bill for a 3-year period. I believe all Members will agree with me, there are very few Members of the House who are naive enough to believe otherwise, that once this legislation is enacted into law 3 years will not see the end of it, but instead at the end of 3 years undoubtedly legislation will be brought before this House to extend the grant of aid for the construction of medical and dental school facilities. That has been the history of all Federal aid programs in the past. That was learned very well I think in connection with the so-called Hill-Burton Act a number of years ago.

A number of years ago at the end of World War II many communities were forced to suspend the construction of hospitals because of a shortage of material and manpower. Bonds had been issued for the construction of these hospitals. Funds had been raised. When the war ended there were not sufficient funds available to finish the hospitals, and a bill was brought in from this same committee. I happened to be a member of it at that time and supported the legislation. It was a bill to give Federal aid on a matching basis to complete the construction of these hospitals which had been interrupted during World War II, \$60 million a year, if I remember correctly, for a 3-year program. That was to solve the dilemma of that day, just to finish the construction of the hospitals which had been under construction and underway when the war interfered with their completion. Yet that program still lives, it still is carried on under the Hill-Burton Act, Federal aid or Federal programs for construction of hospitals throughout the land. I am not sure as to the cost this year but it is better than \$200 million, if my information is correct, instead of the \$60 million a year that we started with; and the end is not in sight.

So I think in considering this legislation as to the need, and seemingly all the testimony indicates that there is a great need for the expansion of the physical facilities of these medical, dental, and other schools of that nature, then the question arises as to whether or not the Congress thinks it is wise to embark upon this new program.

Then the other question revolves around the necessity and the wisdom of keeping in this legislation those sections that deal with the making of loans to students. I would like to remind you, if I may, of several facts.

No. 1. The Congress of the United States in its wisdom through the passage of the Defense Education Act has provided for the granting of Federal loans to college and university students, not quite as much as is provided in this bill but still providing for the Federal Government to contribute 90 percent up to a total of \$5,000, I believe, to assist worthy students through the college or university training courses. Those funds are available now under present law.

This bill would increase the amount of loans that could be made to students, and I will agree that the expenses of those that take graduate studies in medical, dental, and pharmaceutical schools could run more than those in other colleges.

But there are other sources. I have here a letter from the officials of the American Medical Association stating the fact that that association does have a program and a loan fund from which it will make loans to any needy student in any of these fields of education that are covered in this bill, to any of them and all of them. The testimony shows, according to the statements of the American Medical Association, that not a single student in any of these schools has dropped out because of the lack of funds or the inability to get the aid they need to complete their education.

It goes further than that. There are other arrangements made for loans to be made to worthy students available at all times. I am rather proud of the fact that the State from which I hail, the State of Ohio, through the enactment of legislation some time ago set up what is called the Ohio Higher Education Assistance Commission, under which the State of Ohio through this commission, legally constituted and properly authorized, will insure and will guarantee loans to students to complete their higher education, not only in schools where medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, or public health service is taught, but in all types of schools.

These are schools for engineering and schools for education and science and where every type of education may be available—not only in the colleges and universities in Ohio but there are provisions for any student if he is a citizen of the State of Ohio to obtain a loan guaranteed by the State of Ohio. That student may attend any accredited college or university or any type of school—medical schools?—yes. Dental schools?—yes. Schools of pharmacy?—yes and others. This applies anywhere in the United States so long as that person is a citizen of Ohio who can meet the rather easy requirements of the laws of our State so that the commission and the State of Ohio itself will put behind that loan to that young man or that young woman the full faith and credit of the State of Ohio. It is the opinion of those who have studied this problem and who must live with it and who must meet it, there is no reason in the world why by the enactment of this bill, and as it is now written and as it is now being considered by the House, that we should set up another and a different loan program for those who may wish to attend these professional schools. Because all their needs and all their requirements can and will be met by other methods that are already established, already available and are just waiting for the students to apply for these loans.

Let me go further if I may. It just does not appeal to me that it makes commonsense to make loans to students to attend schools if you do not have any room for them in the schools. If the

Congress is to enact legislation of this type, I think the first responsibility of the Congress is to do the brick and mortar job of furnishing the buildings and the laboratories in which you may give opportunity to students who desire to do so to study medicine and dentistry and pharmacy and all these other related professions.

I think it is the first responsibility of the Congress to do that before you begin to make loans. Because, as I said a moment ago, according to the statements that have been furnished to many of us, there has not been a single student now going to any of these institutions of higher learning in these particular fields who has been compelled to stop his or her educational endeavors because of lacks of finance. There is plenty of money available in other ways without enacting into law this particular part of the bill to make loans with all the related provisions for forgiveness, and so forth and so on, that are contained in this measure which is rather complicated and rather difficult to administer, put into effect and carry through.

If this bill becomes law and later on, after you construct these new buildings, and after you increase the capacity of our medical, dental, and other professional schools to accommodate and educate more men and women, then if you find that you need these loans, they can be taken care of at that time, instead of doing it in advance of the time when you have room to put the students into college or into training.

It just does not make commonsense to do this particular thing, because it will be here for a long time to come. If this bill becomes law, if it is enacted it will be with us for a long, long time.

I have made this statement on the floor of the House because I understand there will be amendments offered to strike out the loan provisions of this bill so that the measure may be considered only upon that section. If the loan provisions are stricken it will leave those which deal with the construction of facilities for the use of our medical, chemical, pharmaceutical, or public health training schools, and that is provided for in this bill. Without the loan provision the bill does give a great deal of authority, does provide for the spending of some \$175 million in the next 3 fiscal years and, of course, as I said in the beginning it would probably be just the start of a long-range program of Federal aid to this particular phase of our school system.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate on Thursday next.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there may be some objection to that. Will not the gentleman withdraw his request?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

1963

would withdraw our objection, and I will be glad to sit during special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMEMBER THE 'MAINE'

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include an editorial.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I read with pleased surprise this morning the lead editorial in the Washington Post. It now appears that that newspaper, or the editorial writers, are aware of the fact that we do have a problem in Cuba. I hope that this is only the first of a number of such editorials that we may find in that paper and elsewhere. Many of us during recent weeks and months have been saying on this floor and throughout the United States that as long as there is an aggressive Communist government in Cuba, we have a problem which cannot be solved simply by closing our eyes to it.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the administration will now take active, positive steps to remedy this evil and to remove this cancer from our hemisphere.

The editorial reads as follows:

"REMEMBER THE 'MAINE'"

Something like a consensus on Cuban policy is beginning to emerge in this country. The debate over when and how that policy to be executed should not conceal the growing accord on the policy itself. Last week, the President, the former Vice President, the State Department, and Republican critics of the State Department had different things to say about Cuba, but on two points there was general agreement. And on these two points there is a gathering agreement in the country.

The broad proposition on which there is accumulating accord is simply this: that the existence of a Communist regime, linked to the Soviet Union, in this hemisphere, is a threat to the safety and survival of the United States and of all other free countries in this part of the globe. No administration that openly opposes this belief can long survive. Sooner or later an administration that denounced this maturing conviction would be followed by an alternative government committed to it. In a negative way, there is almost the same accord on how this policy should not be pursued. There is almost universal agreement that invasion, openly and directly, immediately or in the near future, is not the way to pursue our policy.

This aversion to foreign control of Cuba by a hostile power is the constant of American attitudes toward our island neighbor. The Monroe Doctrine was an expression of a view already long-held in this country. It was given even fuller expression in the administration of John Quincy Adams when this country made known its opposition to the transfer of Cuba from Spain to France, England, or any other power. The practical basis of this policy was clearly stated in Daniel Webster's support of President Adams' decision to send delegates to a conference with South American countries, in which the great orator said:

"A Member has said that if Spain chose to transfer the island to any other power she has a right to do so, and we here cannot interfere to prevent her. I must dissent from this opinion. The rights of nations in matters of this kind are much modified by circumstances. Because France or Great Britain

could not rightfully complain of the transfer of Florida to us, it does not follow that we could not complain of the cession of Cuba to one of them. The transfer of Florida to us was not dangerous to the safety of either of these nations, nor fatal to any of their great and essential interests. Proximity of position, neighborhood, whatever augments the power of injuring or annoying, very properly belong to the consideration of all cases of this kind. What might otherwise never be thought of is justified for these reasons and on these grounds."

If the American people are aware of such dangers now, they are aware of other dangers that unhappily and unfortunately also exist and that must be weighed with equal care and caution. Impetuous and impulsive and ill considered acts by this country might bring on the dangers of thermonuclear war without diminishing the dangers of Soviet occupation of Cuba.

Therefore, it must be the object of the Government of the United States to develop some alternative to direct action that will further the policy of this country without incurring the hazards of invasion or like military intervention. It is very urgent that the Government develop such a policy and that it disclose it. It is very plain that, throughout this country, the conviction that the Nation is in peril is hardening to a point where no threats and no fears may be sufficient to inhibit the demand for action against the forces that occupy Cuba. Democratic governments are not wholly free agents. A government that does not develop a program of minimum risk runs the danger of being coerced into a program of maximum risks, almost against its will. The absence of an affirmative design, in such a situation, is dangerous—dangerous to this country, to its neighbors and to the peace of the hemisphere and of the whole world.

The Government of this country, the governments of friendly countries and the government of the Soviet Union as well had better take note of the increasing sense of Americans that the United States is endangered by the Soviet occupation of Cuba. This sense of jeopardy is beginning to pervade the whole body politic. The Soviet government, whatever its fears and doubts, felt compelled, by such an impulse, to send its forces into Hungary. It ought to understand the much greater force that such sentiments exert upon democratic governments. Every day that passes without the termination of the Soviet occupation of Cuba increases the certainty and multiplies the likelihood that another Maine disaster will put the spark to the combustible materials in the Caribbean.

LAOS-SOUTHEAST ASIA-CUBA MESS

(Mr. ALGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress sworn to uphold the Constitution, I intend to champion capitalism, U.S. sovereignty, and the Republic.

So, it is necessary for me to describe President Kennedy's program as a series of failures on the one hand, and attempts to assume dictatorial power on the other, irregardless of existing law.

Yesterday I mentioned a domestic specific. Today I want to call attention to the Laos-southeast Asia-Cuba mess. Without authorization by Congress we are at war in South Vietnam, by President Kennedy's dictation, we are subsidizing Communist takeover of Laos, and we are doing nothing about Khrushchev

and communism in Cuba and its spread throughout this hemisphere, in clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

The dictator complex which seems to be dominating the thinking from the White House is further pointed up in a news story in the Washington Daily News of April 22 by Virginia Prewett. This story reports the Kennedy administration has "been working on a plan for Cuba—a so-called Laos solution wherein the administration was actually attempting to make a deal with Russia to set up a coalition government to include Communists in Cuba. At the very moment his Laos solution is falling about his ears and we are about to give the Communists another complete victory in Asia, the administration is negotiating for the same kind of deal in Cuba. The world has been saved from the disaster of such a sell-out of freedom in Cuba only because of the magic Kennedy touch which results in failure for every administration-sponsored enterprise."

Mr. Speaker, Congress and the people must be aroused to the terrible danger we face from such arrogance, such disregard of constitutional powers, such an easy assumption to dictatorship now taking place in America. Once more, in the name of the people of the Fifth District of Texas, and as a responsible Member of Congress, sworn to uphold the Constitution and to protect from all enemies, foreign and domestic, I call upon the President to tell the American people his plans for the kind of government he envisions for this Republic.

I call upon the President to tell the American people what his plans are in connection with this violation of the Monroe Doctrine and the taking over of this hemisphere by the Communists and to confide in us without managing the news.

DISCUSSION OF ENTRANCE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GUERRILLA TRAINEES IN CUBA

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the amount of sabotage and subversion going on throughout the Americas with Cuba as the spawning grounds, as well as the high degree of efficiency on the part of the Communists in Cuba, has been brought to my attention in the form of a questionnaire which all guerrilla trainees from the Americas have to fill in upon their arrival in Cuba's training camp.

Containing 38 questions, the questionnaire was turned in by a Communist defector who was being trained in Cuba for Communist subversion in South America. The list shows that Communists, through Cuba as the beachhead, are blueprinting a plan for the communization of Latin America through subversion, sabotage, armed action, and encouraged uprisings, and every other detestable Marxist-Leninist tool being taught in Cuban training schools.

It shows the intent and purpose of Cuban subversive training camps,

April 23

namely, the overthrow of the governments from which the trainees come.

It shows that Cuba is the focal point for gathering vital information for subversive activities by the international Communist conspiracy.

It proves that the forceful overthrow and sabotage activities, if peaceful political subversion does not succeed, is the program in the Western Hemisphere.

It proves long-range planning with Cuba as the base for future arming and training of subversives and for eventual striking at vital installations and existing weak spots.

After the usual questions dealing with the identity, occupation, and places of residence of the trainee, more salient questions are posed:

For example, question 15 asks: Give a description of the police organization and the investigative agencies of your place. Who are the officers in charge of repression? What is their rank? List the names and addresses of any victims of their repressive actions and state if they are persons of strong opinions.

Question 17 asks: What are the possibilities of guerrilla warfare in your region? What would be the morale of the people with regards to this struggle?

Question 18 asks: What is the morale and the preparation of the army for an antiguerrilla war?

Some questions deal with smuggling activities, such as question 23, which asks: List the names and addresses of persons whom you have knowledge to be involved in smuggling activities; and some questions deal exclusively with obtaining information about military establishments in the countries in question. Question 36 asks: Where are the military aircraft located in your region? How many aircraft are there? How are the airfields guarded? What type of documents are needed by the workers to gain access to the airfield? Are the workers under vigilance by the authorities?

Question 38 asks: Where are the naval bases located in your region? Where are the river patrol stations located, if any?

This list, the full text of which I am placing in the Record, evidences that Cuba is a clear and present danger to the security of the hemisphere and that it is urgent that we formulate planned action to eliminate Castro's communism.

Incidentally, U.S. citizens going to Cuba for subversive training are called upon to answer this same questionnaire, another reason why I am continuing my efforts to have the open door to subversion in this hemisphere, the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City, closed, and Americans who are taking this subversive route to Cuba prosecuted.

A copy of the questionnaire follows:

ENTRANCE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR GUERRILLA
TRAINEES

1. Complete name.
2. Place and date of birth.
3. Residence address.
4. Professional training and occupation before entering Cuba.
5. Names and addresses of parents, brothers, and/or sisters.
6. Occupation of members of the immediate family. List title of position and address

of office if any of them occupies a position of responsibility with the government, the armed forces, or the police.

7. Names and addresses of friends who occupy positions of responsibility in the government, the armed forces, or the police. List the titles of their positions, the addresses of their offices, and make a brief statement on the responsibilities of their positions.

8. Have you ever occupied a government position? If so, list title of position, address, the names and addresses of friends employed there. Reason for leaving? How long employed there? Are your friends still employed there?

9. Past and present political affiliations. Duration of affiliation and reasons for terminating them.

10. Have you held any office in the labor unions? In a cultural, social, or sport club? What was the nature of the office held? What was the political orientation of the club or other organization? In the case of a cultural or sport club, were there any events and competitions sponsored by it? If member of a sport club, what type of physical training was administered? Did this training take place in the country? What interest was shown by the police or other authorities about this training?

11. List the revolutionary organizations of your place. Who are their leaders and what is their capability?

12. Describe your personal experience in the underground struggle.

13. Have you ever been arrested? How many times? On what charges? Where were you arrested? How did you obtain your freedom?

14. Have you ever been deported? Reason? How many times? When?

15. Give a description of the police organization and the investigative agencies of your place. Who are the officers in charge of repression? What is their rank? List the names and addresses of any victims of their repressive actions and state if they are persons of strong opinions.

16. What means of transportation are used by the repressive organs of your place? What are the means of communication? What type of information net they have?

17. What are the possibilities of guerrilla warfare in your region? What would be the morale of the people with regards to this struggle?

18. What is the morale and the preparation of the army for an anti-guerrilla war?

19. What is the morale of the police? Was its response to acts of sabotage efficient?

20. What would be the attitude of the police subalterns and men in the eventuality of a revolution? Would they be favorably inclined?

21. What repressive acts by the police or the army are considered the most oppressive in your place?

22. What acts of resistance by the people have brought about the strongest measures of repression by the police?

23. List the names and addresses of persons whom you have knowledge to be involved in smuggling activities.

24. What are the articles most commonly smuggled in and by what method?

25. Give the names and addresses of any smugglers you came in contact. What would be the best way to approach them? When did you contact them? Where? Who are the ones you have most confidence and trust? On what basis?

26. What is situation on the borders of your country? What type of control does the government maintain? Who are the border guards of your region? Whom do you know personally?

27. By what means can one enter your country and what are the necessary procedures?

28. Can one obtain personal identification documents by paying cash?

29. What documents are the citizens of your country required to carry and how are they obtained normally?

30. Can a foreigner buy a home? Can he establish a commercial firm?

31. How can one obtain the necessary documents for an accredited institution?

32. Where do government officials gather? Where do the governing classes meet? How can one obtain admission to these social gatherings? How can credentials be obtained? Can one pay his dues or fees in cash?

33. How many persons know that you are in Cuba? List their names and addresses.

34. How and when did they come to know?

35. What was the length of your military service? Where? What units? What rank did you attain?

36. Where are the military aircraft located in your region? How many aircraft are there? How are the airfields guarded? What type of documents are needed by the workers to gain access to the airfield? Are the workers under vigilance by the authorities?

37. Where are the military bases located? Which are the units in garrison there? What are the means of transport and communication to them?

38. Where are the naval bases located in your region? Where are the river patrol stations located if any?

OHIO AMERICAN LEGION ESSAY
WINNER

(Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Mr. Speaker, the American Legion of Ohio annually sponsors an American essay contest among the young students of our great State.

This year I am very proud that one of my constituents, George Meese, a 12th-grade student of 5132 East Farnhurst, Lyndhurst, Ohio, is one of the winners.

One merely has to read his essay to understand why George Meese was declared a winner. He gives one the assurance that our youth of today have an abiding respect for America and a sincere sense of citizenship responsibility.

May I take this occasion to congratulate George Meese on his splendid essay, and include it herewith in the Record.

The essay follows:

AMERICAN LEGION ESSAY "HOW CAN I HELP
PRESERVE THE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY"

(By George Meese, 132 East Farnhurst, Lyndhurst, Ohio, 12th grade, Brush High School)

I am a high school senior. I am a series of digits at a test-computing center; I am an impersonal, lifeless statistic on numerous records; I am almost insignificant. Despite this, one simple factor keeps me from becoming an oblivious atom in my own environment. I am an American.

I was created by a Supreme Being through my parents, and at the instant of my creation, I became an American citizen. Because a group of men had the courage and genius to create a new and unique society, I am not equal to a particle of dust, I am a human individual.

Our American democracy is founded on the simple proposition that every man is a sov-